DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 285 984 CE 048 177

AUTHOR	Miller, Pamela F., Ed.; Coady, William T., Ed.
TITLE	Report of the Proceedings of the Conference on the Future World of Work (St. Louis, Missouri, October 12, 1984).
INSTITUTION	Southern Illinois Univ., Carbondale.
SPONS AGENCY	Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield. Dept. of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.
PUB DATE	12 Oct 84
GRANT	R-2B-26-X-4.2-522
NOTE	92p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Vocational Education; Career Education; Ethical Instruction; *Ethics; Fused Curriculum; *Futures (of Society); *Integrated Curriculum; *Moral Values; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; *Values Education; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Vocational Ethics

ABSTRACT

A team of consultants met with personnel from the Vocational Ethics Infusion Project to discuss vocational ethics from the perspectives of the current and future world of work. This activity was undertaken with the goal of defining the domain of vocational ethics. Issues in the first session included whether the future world of work presents an optimistic scenario; implications for the social trends; the meaning, value, and understanding of justice; the discrepancy between macro economic stability and micro instability; security and creativity; the loss of the middle class and the growth of the underclass; overeducation versus miseducation; trying to match people to jobs; participatory management; problem-solving and transition skills to help students become flexible and adaptable; how one learning place reproduces the variety and diversity of workplace situations; and infusion of teaching of professional ethics. In the afternoon session, participants discussed the type of ethical beliefs or thinking skills needed by a worker facing the continuum between the scientific management model and the sociotechnical paradigm; distinctions between vocational ethics and general ethical responsibilities; features of the current work ethic; a working definition of vocational ethics; problems of infusion; and implementation of the teaching of ethics. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED285984

Report on the Proceedings of

The Conference on the Future World of Work

Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri
October 12, 1984

Edited By:

Pamela F. Miller, Ph.D.
Director, The Center for Vocational Ethics
Southern Illinois University - Carbondale

William T. Coady
The Center for Vocational Ethics

The preparation of this report was supported by a grant from the Illinois Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Grant No. R-2B, 26-X-4.2-522.

CE 042 177

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P Miller
W Coady

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REPORT ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF
THE CONFERENCE ON THE FUTURE WORLD OF WORK
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI
October 12, 1984

Introduction

In 1984, the Wabash and Ohio Valley Special Education District received a grant from the Illinois Office of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education to develop a plan for the infusion of the teaching of vocational ethics into the career, vocational, and technical education programs at the kindergarten through post-secondary level in Illinois. The first task faced by the Vocational Ethics Infusion Project (VEIP) was to define the domain of vocational ethics. Toward this goal, a team of consultants met with project personnel on the Washington University campus in St. Louis, Missouri on October 12, 1984 to discuss vocational ethics from the perspectives of the current and future world of work. The edited dialogue that follows was taken from those proceedings. Consultants included Dr. Arthur Wirth, Professor of Education, Department of Education, Washington University-Medical; Dr. Frank C. Pratzner, Senior Research Specialist, National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University; and Mr. Bruce Jennings, Associate for Policy Studies, Hasting Center/Institute of Society, Ethics and the Life Sciences, Hasting-on-Hudson, New York. VEIP personnel in attendance included Dr. Pamela F. Miller, Project Director and Nancy Rubin, Research Assistant. Completing the panel was Dr. Peter Seidman, VEIP Project

Officer representing the Illinois State Board of Education, Office of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education.

Miller: In general, does the future world of work present an optimistic or pessimistic scenario?

Jennings: The most optimistic picture I have encountered goes like this: Technology will relieve the work force of its most dangerous, most tedious, most physically debilitating tasks. The legacy of industrial capitalism's physical brutalization of work will be progressively narrowed and maybe even eventually eliminated by robotics.

The work force will be much more oriented toward brains rather than muscle and will be oriented toward making judgments directed at innovating and controlling the workplace. The social interaction among workers in the workplace will not be by the generosity of management but out of the dictates of the organization of the workplace itself. This will create an opening, according to the optimistic scenario, for greater democratization of control of the workplace, for greater participation by workers in management decisions that affect the quality of their work environment, and indeed affect the production process itself.

Now going along with that picture also are statistics that indicate the agriculture sector of the economy is receding and the manufacturing sector of the economy is shrinking and will continue to do so. By the end of the century most people will neither grow things nor make things. Most of the work force will be providing services of various kinds: white collar, clerical, sales, etc. The optimistic conclusion from that seems to be that this is going to demand more creativity and thus provide more security.

Another piece of the optimistic picture is the argument: that this kind of technology will really yield full employment and we will be able to avoid having a large sector of unemployable people as a permanent welfare class. The optimistic scenario says, "Yes, we will." The final piece of the optimistic scenario is the transition: where we are now and how we get to this place they've described. The optimists think the transition will be relatively non-disruptive and painfree; we will work out programs that train workers in additional skills.

On the other hand, the pessimistic version of this scenario predicts a tremendous trauma in making the transition. Pessimists fear that our public and private institutions are not very well equipped to cope with the trauma ahead. We may have a lost generation--a lost segment of the work force are left out by their 40s and early 50s, can't be retrained, and are not able to make the transition in any kind of equitable fashion. We're going to face the prospect of going from a $25-an-hour, good benefits job in a heavy industry that's declining to working at McDonald's for minimum wage and no benefits. Or worse still, perhaps for the family, a husband being permanently laid off and the wife going to work for the first time, which disrupts the family income and family life.

Also, the pessimistic picture foresees not a rising tide of high technology lifting all boats, but a hardening and a bifurcation of the class system--an elite of high skill, high creativity jobs at one end and a mass of low skill, low creativity jobs at the other end, with the great blue collar middle class produced by the most recent phase of industrialization shrinking and gradually disappearing.

In sum, an optimistic view is a relatively manageable transition of creative possibilities for all at the end of the road; the pessimistic view is of a wrenching transition leading to very limited possibilities for many, perhaps most workers.

Seidman: What about the implications for the social trends compared to the technical point of view of technology?

Jennings: I would hasten to broaden the discussion to other people. I'm giving you my first impression from what I've read and heard. I have heard some rather interesting claims, I think, by people like Daniel Yankelovich who is saying he finds that for today's generation of young workers the material rewards of the job are less important to them than the intrinsic benefits that they get from meaningful, personally fulfilling kinds of work. Unlike an earlier generation or the current generation, they're willing to trade off material gain for job satisfaction. They're willing to accept less money for a more satisfying job. The converse of that, I guess, is they're less willing to tolerate boring, highly authoritarian, trivial kinds of jobs. It seems to me if it's indicative of an attitude that this generation of workers will hold on to as they grow older; it would seem to be the psychological or motivational basis for a demand to push in the direction of that kind of greater involvement in democratization. It reinforces the optimistic scenario to the extent that here's a direction that technology is going in, here's a direction in which the social organization of the workplace is going in, and here's the direction that the psychological needs of the current generation of workers is going in, and all those things are mutually complementary.

Wirth: I got interested in this whole thing about work in the mid-70s. I began to get angry about the things I thought were happening in the schools turning education into a production function, reducing it more and more towards teaching for test scores. The model seemed to be coming from industry. I decided to see if anybody in industry had doubts about the scientific management model. That then led me into a lot of explorations. In terms of your question of optimistic scenario, one of the things that occurs to me is the point of view of Robert Reich. Reich takes the position that we are in the midst of a dramatic social change. In the 70s and 80s we've entered a stage where there's only one market--the world market. The mode of production perfected in the first part of the 20th century was mainly standardized mass production. Specialized Taylor's management, work designed for relatively low education immigrant and rural people in the work force. It performed magically for us. But we're out of the period where that's viable. Third world countries can now work from that same model and do it cheaper. So, Reich argues that the advanced industrial societies like our own have to take advantage of its special strength. A highly educated work force that can be actively involved in flexible adaptations to a work environment that's going to be marked permanently by turbulent, ongoing, unpredictable change. We will have to shift our emphasis into high technology. That would support the notion that for survival we will have to create a climate and style of work that would tap the brains of more people at work. Reich argues that this means a shift away from the more hierarchical organizational model toward more flexible horizontal, matrix-style work organizations. That would be the case for moving toward more involvement, for tapping

the brains of people at work in high tech, and in the transformations of many industrial corporations. One of the things I got interested in was the move in this direction even in the more traditional industrial workplaces. A prototype model, that later shifted to GM, was one that was developed at Harman International Industries at Bolivar, Tennessee. It was an auto mirror plant. Sidney Harman, its President, and Irving Bluestone, Vice-President of the UAW and one of the leaders for moving toward workplace democracy, presented in a seminar that Michael Maccoby conducted in the early 70s. Maccoby, Director of the Harvard Center for Technology Work and Character in Washington, was one of the pioneers in suggesting that there be a redesign of work toward more worker involvement.

In this Bolivar plant you had a lot of people who were not even high school graduates. It has been studied a lot and has had a good deal of success.

The point is that there is some evidence that even in lower skill kinds of work there's some recognition that it's more productive to involve the people both in the quality of the work environment and in confronting how to handle problems. So it is incorrect to think that worker participation would be relevant only for high tech and high skill workers.

In terms of the involvement of the family, I had Peter Fay from Anheiser-Busch, who is Director of Organizational Research and Development for their new plant operations, into class a few weeks ago. He was director for designing work at the new brewery in Baldwinsville, New York where Anheiser-Busch is now making a major commitment toward socio-technical management, with the assumption that you have to combine

the technical with worker involvement. At Baldwinsville they found they were paying attention to the effects of the new style of work on families instead of just employees in 9 to 5 sort of work. In the new kind of workplace, employees brought home more discussion about their work. Wives may wonder what's going on. In this case, the company felt it important to bring the wives in to help them understand the rationale of the new work.

I suppose, on the optimistic side, another dimension would be something that I think they found in some of the studies in Norway. As they moved in the direction of more work participation it seemed to have spillover effects into community involvement. There was less apathy and less noninvolvement. This would be a happy development where you don't really separate your work life from your outside life. So, those are a few things that are running through my mind on the optimistic side.

Pratzner: Among the things that seem to be happening as a result of some of the changes in the workplace is a continued increase in the amount of leisure time available to workers. I think that increase in leisure has a lot of consequences both in the work sense and in the economy sense. That, combined with a lot of demographic trends and demographic conditions that already exist right now, is going to have an impact on the workplace until the year 2000 that seems quite consequential. For example, the age of the population, the age of the work force, the age of the country, the population of the country, these are going to continue to rise between now and the year 2000. What happens to the baby boomers in their late 30s and early 40s? A lot has to do with the way we prepare for the future and how we define society in general.

Jennings: I came across a very striking statistic that will certainly affect what we're concerned with in terms of vocational education. Seventy percent of the work force in the year 2000 is already at work today. So, if you're interested in influencing the characteristics, motivation, values, etc. in the work force in the year 2000, you're not going to do it by only getting people who are now in kindergarten through 12th-grade. If vocational ethics and vocational education are going to have an impact, it's also going to have to be as continuing education, basically adult education, just because of the numbers.

Pratzner: Another part of that, it seems to me, is the rapid growth of minority populations, especially Hispanics and Blacks. It is suggested that these groups will continue to grow at a faster rate than whites in the U.S. Many larger school systems, for example, in large labor markets, will be heavily dominated by minority groups that hold different values, different views of schools, work and community life. I think this growth in minority populations is likely to change or influence a lot of institutions, including schools.

Wirth: Let me try a couple of things that were triggered off by his (Jennings') comments. I read a couple books recently on recurrent education. One of them was written by Slobin and the other was by Henry Levin of Stanford. They talk about recurrent education as a rising star. I think it follows from what you were saying. I mean the nature of America is going to change dramatically. The people who are going to be at work in the year 2000 are already here. That means many will have to relearn and retrain. We need a work force that is capable of adapting to change and relearning and shifting. Flexibility, or the capacity to

relearn, it seems to me, becomes more and more one of the critical qualities.

Economist Hazel Henderson, at the World Future Society about a year ago, took the position that for the first time it's pragmatic to be ethical. So, while we're looking at the optimistic side, there may be a practical need for more democratic work in order to survive and prosper, and a more humane way of relating to people. Thus, a kind of ethical test of institutions is whether they function to support the learning of all the people at work.

In terms of demographic changes, I really don't know what the implications are for women now becoming a massive part of the work force. I'd like to hear more about what others think about that. I know Elizabeth Kantor suggested things like when women are in the work force, there are pressures to move toward more flexible work arrangements, daycare, and maybe even schedule adjustments.

In Scandinavia, they have maternity time off for the fathers for a time after the child is born. Since both parents are in the work force now, traditional roles make less and less sense. We'll be raising a different set of questions about these things. I don't know whether there are pressures on women to learn how to hack it the way men always have or whether there is some different style or values that women could bring to work.

Seidman: In a recent issue of Phi Delta Kappan, there was a study reporting that women do not reach the same moral level as men do. In fact, now they have research to show that women do but they use different criteria--less analytical and rational and more subjective.

Jennings: Carol Gilligan's conclusion is that women tend to think about ethical problems less in terms of abstract principles and more in terms of the effects it's going to have on social relationships, social bonds, and contextual questions. The women, she found, tended to place moral questions more in a kind of social context or interpersonal relations context whereas men tended to abstract and think more in terms of roles. But I don't think that is the exactly same dichotomy as subjective versus objective. There is nothing irrational or emotional about placing an ethical question in a contextual setting.

Pratzner: There's a good book that deals with corporate capitalism and community involvement called A New Social Contract: The Economy and Government After Reagan by Carnoy, Shearer, and Romberger (1983). The authors talk about various policies and strategies for getting firms to accept more of their social responsibility and the consequences for a lot of their corporate policies. It's a very interesting book and touches on a lot of related issues.

The other thing that occurs to me is the growing notion that as a result of the development of technology we're moving toward a bimodal, dual labor force with very few highly skilled jobs and people at one end and a large number of unskilled workers and jobs at the other end. That's something very different from what we have had: a large number of blue collar middle-level jobs. This sort of separation into very distinct classes socio-economically seems to raise a whole set of important issues and concerns.

Wirth: I think that industries, corporations are now confronted with a relatively new set of issues. The classical model was concerned primarily

with the bottom line and let other things shake out. Is the concern for the ecological health of the community and some concern for some democratic qualities at work merely a new hype, or just manipulative? I think those asking corporations and American industries to incorporate things like that are asking a lot. They are not typically skewed that way. One of the things that struck me in Norway was that after World War II, in particular, they brought over Taylor's model in their workplaces. By the late 60s, they were beginning to get uneasy because they said, "The way we're living at work is contradictory to the way we live in our communities." They got the employer's association, the unions, and the government to set up a commission to see how they could change the design of work so it would be more consistent with what they saw as the democratic values of Norwegian culture.

Now, that is a question I don't hear a lot of talk about in this country. On the other hand, for practical reasons of survival, there is the notion that we should move in that direction. I think it's a question of whether capitalism has to be transformed in some way to really give priority to these quality questions--ecological and democratic. I think there is going to be a lot of tension over that, a lot of lip service, a lot of all kinds of games going on. It could be optimistic in the sense that reality is demanding a concern for questions that weren't typically asked heretofore. In the more classical way of organizing work with the more hierarchical style where there were a lot of specific prescriptions, people got security from operating within the rules. If there have to be more flexible responses, that's going to require different qualities in which, presumably, some people at work will have more flexibility and

more autonomy. There will be more collaboration and the old question of whether you can combine discipline with freedom. I think that might become more of an issue than when work was more rule-bound.

Jennings: I'd like to introduce a topic that should be important to our discussion. That is the question of the meaning of justice, the value of justice, and the understanding of justice, the quality in American society in all we've been talking about. The reason that it occurs to me to raise it now is the comment you were making about the evolution away from rule-bound organizations of work and procedures governing work to more autonomy, flexibility, and adaptation. Again, it seems to me that this forecast, by people like Reich and others, is very much a two-edged sword. It can become autonomy and self-direction and so forth if there is genuine democratization of power and authority in the workplace, as some people envision. But there can be only a pseudo-participation--that has only the form but not the substance of democratization in the workplace so that the adversarial and conflicting relationships between labor and management still remain but look different and are more submerged. We could, at the same time, lose some of the formal rule structures that have been built up, mainly to protect workers from management in certain ways by precisely limiting managerial prerogatives. If, in the name of worker self-management, we are careless about pushing away some of those rules that limit managerial prerogatives so that managerial power is expanded but the power is not really placed in the hands of the workers, then what are we going to be left with? We're going to be left with a situation in which justice and equity become problematic.

By justice and equity, I mean something like an environment in which you have reasonable expectations that you'll be rewarded on the basis of merit or the basis of agreements that you've entered into. That it will be difficult for one party who has power over you to unilaterally change the rules of the game in midcourse. Again, Yankelovich presents some very striking statistics. He says that maybe one-fourth of the work force believes that the rewards (the pay) people get are based on merit and the talents they have and merit what they do. Most people in this country, I think, have a sense of justice that everybody should have equal opportunity and that inequalities that exist ought to reflect real inequalities of merit and not just accidents of birth, power, privilege, or whatever. It is what you are rather than who you know that ought to determine any inequalities that we allow to exist in society. I think that's the American sense of justice still and yet there's the perception by a vast majority of working class Americans anyway that that is not the way the world really works. In short, today most Americans perceive the system as being unjust by their own standards of what justice is. I see a possibility that that is just going to be exacerbated by this movement of flexibility and autonomy.

Perhaps we get a little glimpse of what the future or future struggles might look like in a furor which is pretty close to home for teachers. That is the dispute and controversy that has been raised by the discussion of merit pay for teachers as a way of improving the quality of education. It seems this is indicative of a move, of an attempt to move away from formalization and a rule-governed workplace for teachers to a situation in which more discretion is put in the hands of principals, administrators,

evaluators, whoever it is who is supposed to be judging the quality of the teaching. Then they're going to have the discretion to parcel out financial rewards or other benefits on the basis of that evaluation. Many workers, teachers, might question the objectivity of that approach.

So, again, it's the two-edged sword phenomenon. Yes, greater autonomy for the worker, greater responsibility, but really the question is who evaluates performance and by what criteria is the performance evaluated on this autonomous, responsible worker? Perhaps the challenge facing us is to sweep away enough of the formal rule-bound structures in the workplace to permit autonomy, creativity, and flexibility but not to sweep so many of those rules away that we lose our sense that we have just and objective criteria for evaluating performance criteria that are public and can be negotiated and shared. You know what you're supposed to do in a fairly clear-cut way because it is rule-governed. The expectations are rule-governed so you don't have to rely upon the subjective or even arbitrary discretion of an evaluator in the absence of clear-cut rules and expectations. How do we get rid of enough rules to allow flexibility but keep enough rules to maintain a sense of justice?

Wirth: I think it's a very important issue. Irving Bluestone of the UAW tried to confront that in the style they developed in Bolivar. He said the adversarial relationship between labor and management should be maintained on the classical issues--wages, safety, etc. Then you should have joint management labor committees to deal more flexibly with the way people work and modify things in the workplace. He's saying it's really important to maintain contractual relationships on many basic items involving workers. Actually, with the history of management you could

make a case that it has managed to co-opt a lot of so-called reform movements while managers kept their eye on the main goal of keeping control located in their own hands. In the human relations movement, there would be interviews with workers which became a way of letting workers vent their feelings to drain off discontent. It appeared to be very humanistic but it could be just another way to keep basic control arrangements in place. Unions justifiably have a lot of skepticism on what can happen when the rules shift.

Miller: I wonder if it's not so much the need to remove rules but rather who makes the rules. As a teacher, for example, I might be inclined to worry about merit pay in the hands of a capricious administrator--one individual. However, if I was evaluated by peers, which is the thing they are supposed to do at the university level, that might seem to be more acceptable.

Wirth: I don't think the analogy with the university really applies here. At the university, the differences are sorted out in terms of quantifiable products, i.e., "How many papers did you write?" I'm overdoing it but it's basically true. At least here nobody goes into classes and tries to decide which teaching style is better. You don't have anything comparable to the faculty publication list in the lower schools, except test scores. Teachers are told test scores are quantifiable and "objective." The analogy is "If you're a shoemaker make a shoe; if you're a teacher produce high test scores."

Rubin: But the teacher is limited by the raw materials she gets while the shoemaker has a lot more control. I've heard the problem with merit pay suggested as: If teachers are given merit pay and you found out your

child got in the room where the teacher did not get merit pay last year, would you want your child in that classroom? It overlooks the fact that certain teachers are better with certain kinds of students. Some are much better with students who are slower, need a lot more reinforcement, or more time to learn but often do not get the kinds of reward (scores) they should be getting.

Seidman: In looking at the philosophy that moves vocational education, I've seen that vocational education operates on an employer-oriented principle. All the materials are developed for dealing with the workers' view of the workplace--deal with the rules of the workplace. The rules of the workplace are employer made, created, and implemented. I don't think it's a matter of sweeping away certain ones and keeping certain ones. I think you do need the rules. I think it's a matter of sweeping away all of the present rules. I think we will be forced to sweep away and create a kind of a collective, organized chaos and make up totally new rules if indeed the trends we are recognizing are going to occur. The optimistic view says the new rules recognize justice and equality. The new rules recognize the responsibilities of both the worker to the employer and the employer to the worker and the rights or prerogatives of the worker to the employer and the employer to the worker. Both have rights. Both have responsibilities. Those are not recognized now either in the workplace. That's why you have unions. The optimistic side says we recognize all these rights and responsibilities of both sides. The rules in fact recognize a new sense of autonomy and flexibility while at the same time recognizing the profit motive of the private sector. I think the pessimistic side is either maintenance or an attempt to maintain

the rules totally defined by one side--the antagonism and the tension between management and labor. Or, you sweep away all the rules and then find the same kind of chaotic situation in which nobody knows what's going on. You get completely capricious, arbitrary decisions being made because the rules are changing as you go along. That's the pessimistic side of it. We all know the rules of management that you're bound by as a worker, but what is management bound by in terms of the rights of the worker to be an autonomous, flexible individual? That we don't know. That's not recognized now and it's the major weakness of the present educational systems' education for work and for employment. A major weakness is in the recognition of the rights of the individual. If we don't solve that, if we don't come up with a reasonable definition of the rules of work, we're in trouble if indeed the pessimistic or optimistic scenario occurs. Autonomy is coming. You better do something about defining those rules, redefining those rules.

Jennings: Can I raise another issue about the future scenarios we've been discussing? I guess it's part of the pessimistic scenario or at least the problematic scenario. It is what some people have called the discrepancy between macro economic stability and micro instability. Sometimes the economy, the high tech and service sector oriented kind of economy of the future, may be healthy as a whole precisely by virtue of an extremely rapid and fluctuating job market. Because of the up-and-down of individual firms in individual communities, you have better foreign competitiveness, balance of trade, and so on. You have macro growth and stability but at the micro level you have a tremendous amount of instability. The healthiest economic communities in this country today,

apparently, are communities that every year lose 50% of their jobs. They're "healthy" because they're also able to create new jobs to maintain their level of employment and level of economic growth, but they're not the same jobs. They're not continuous, stable economic communities. They're economic communities that are in great turmoil all the time. The stagnant communities of our country also lose jobs but they do not have the ability to replace those jobs. Well, what does that lead to? It leads to things like the fact that the average American family moves once every 3 years or whatever the statistic is. There's a tremendous mobility in our population--a tremendous turnover of jobs. If it's going to be that way in the future, if the future holds the prospect that we can achieve macro stability only by having micro instability, then it means the work force is not only going to have to be flexible on the job but extremely flexible between jobs and have a tremendous amount of geographic mobility.

Now, what does that mean for the very important question that Peter raises of the responsibility of the employer to the employee? One example of responsibility has been the supposed Japanese model for some of their workers. It's just the elite male work force, which, in fact, still is a kind of corporate paternalism. You really are guaranteed a job for life or at least until about age 55. You get a lot of benefits. The company really does take care of you and you don't always have to worry about losing your job. The Japanese are able to find other incentives for their workers to have them do good work, etc., without the threat of being fired. Now, to the American mind, that's hard to fathom because we have used the threat of job loss and the insecurity

that we build into our job situation as one of our principle characteristic values. Well, I agree with you that vocational education should address this, but can we talk meaningfully about the rights that workers have or the responsibilities the company has to the workers when we sketch out an economic scene of such incredible fluidity and instability? What the employer says to the worker: "When you take a job with my company, this ain't no marriage! There ain't no long-term commitments here. I'll get your talents for a few years and then expect you to move on." If this is part of the pessimistic scenario, then it's really a society of short-term contracts or commitments--a society of every time you're in a particular job you have to be looking forward to the next job. Your career is like a chess game. Obviously, in some jobs you have to make moves that might not be wholly beneficial for your present employer in order to enhance your future employability. I think we already see that at the white collar managerial level. In fact, that's one of the things that people like Abernathy and Hayes at Harvard Business School are crabbing about now. These MBA managers are out there now and their careers depend upon showing high levels of profitability over a relatively short time frame like 5 years. They have to do that and then they move on. MBA managers don't move up in the same company but keep moving horizontally between industries because they supposedly have this package of skills called an MBA that they can take anywhere. They're neglecting corporate modernization and R & D investment because they're making short-term rational decisions which are long-term irrational decisions. Now, is that career pattern going to permeate the entire work force? Are we going to have this very mobile, very unsettled work force with no

sense of a long-term commitment between employer and employee, and no sense of long-term commitment for social relationships between peers at the same level in the workplace because you know you're going to be gone in 3 or 4 years, living somewhere else, and working somewhere else? I wonder what the notion of the moral responsibilities, the reciprocal responsibilities in that kind of a setting, look like.

Wirth: There's another point of view which Reich articulates. Reich's argument is that in order to have a work force that will feel secure enough to risk making adaptations to change and learning new skills, etc., you have to give them a Japanese type of job security. When there's shutdowns, slowdowns, or plants are being retooled, the corporation and/or government will tend to guarantee retraining programs. That's what the Japanese do when they shut down for retooling; the work force knows it's going to be in retraining programs that can lead to shifts, etc. One possibility is that corporations would see that some sector of the work force would guarantee job security in order to be willing to accept all the changes. There's discrimination against women and the older people--there's still going to be a sea of people with job security and a sea of other fishes that are just out there in the ocean.

Jennings: You get the two-tier problem work force.

Wirth: That can raise tensions between the older work force and the younger ones who maybe won't have the same guarantees. One of the arguments they'd use for giving security to the corp is that it will presumably motivate them to be more participating and have more long-term commitments. There's another thing that occurred to me when Peter Fay from Anheiser-Busch was here. He said that A-B is polarized in that they

have some breweries on the classical model like the one in St. Louis out of a kind of German-Teutonic tradition. They've pretty much decided that their conditions aren't ripe or right to make changes there. But for the new breweries they're creating, they start thinking in terms of corporate culture. Fay says a lot depends with what you do with the structure of work and the functionings of work in terms of what he calls the core values. This is oversimplified but in the more traditional brewery the core values in one sense were to make money, profitability, etc. For the union, it was concerned about wages, safety, etc. In the new Baldwinsville plant, they keep the core values in the contract: security, safety, pay, and all that sort of thing. But they include values like individualization and democracy. They had year-long planning before they opened the plant. They had people from the blue collar force and administrators together with the architects to think seriously about the meaning of values like these in the plant design as well as working relationships. I think one order of problems posed for vocational education is that we're in a time when both the older style work and presumably a newer one are out there at the same time. How do you prepare people in vocational education when we have both things going on out there at the same time? If you make all your plans in terms of the values of the old corporate culture, you're probably fooling yourself. The concept of corporate culture and the core values that really lie behind corporate function and structure is an interesting one to have in the picture.

Rubin: The statistic about 70% of the year 2000 work force now being in the work force makes me wonder. How much really the world of work is going to be changed if we already have 70% of the people there?

Wirth: You think they've internalized what they're going to be pretty much?

Rubin: I think so. I wonder a lot and am concerned about people who have lost their jobs in the last 5 or 10 years in the auto industry and the steel industry. These people were sort of the corporate family which I think has worked to their detriment. They worked in the factory, their father worked in the factory, and suddenly they're 40 years old and they have no job.

For some, it's hard for them to believe that job won't someday come back and they will go back to the factory. How much it is going to change and the feeling it has to: that people need to be more flexible, to change jobs, or whatever in the future?

Miller: I'm wondering about this idea of security and creativity. My experience has been that the less satisfied an individual is the more likely they are to be creative. I mean, necessity being the mother of invention.

Seidman: It's creative for whom? If it's creative for the company, then they need the security to know that they can be wild and crazy and the company is not going to get rid of them--sort of a corporate culture concept.

Miller: For example, if you have people who know their job is secure; I use a university model. People with tenure do not tend to seek out grants and different kinds of creative activities, in general. There are the diamonds out there who do, but generally it's the assistant professor who doesn't have tenure who's got to prove something that does the most creative work.

In the background I've had in creativity, there are two views: you can promote creativity through obstacles rather than facilitating, making it easy. I'm not sure there's really any consensus as to how that is best done. So, I think at this point in time we don't know. We need some basic security that ideas and thoughts will be listened to but to guarantee that the job is there regardless. If you have ideas or not or are productive or not, I don't think will promote creativity.

Pratzner: From what I understand from the literature, an awful lot of jobs in the future won't depend on a lot of high creativity on the part of individuals. The jobs that are increasing--not so much in percentages such as in high technology but in sheer numbers--are jobs like janitors and secretaries, some areas of teaching, some jobs in banking and a lot of jobs in fast food, waiters, waitresses, and hotel people. There is a real question of how much creativity those jobs can tolerate and how much creativity is needed to perform those kinds of jobs. The jobs do not necessarily offer great opportunities to express one's creativity or individuality. Therefore, to look for other means to do that, I suppose, you look for leisure pursuits and other ways to express yourself as an individual, not so much through the nature of the work itself.

Miller: So, we're talking about two different worlds of work really?

Pratzner: Very different, for university professors or high level managers of big international corporations, versus people on assembly lines or people in the fast food and service industry.

Jennings: Can we ask in that sector or at that level what the relationship is between security or the lack thereof? Or, to use a better word, what the relationship might be between the recognition of the responsibilities

the employer owes the employee on the one hand and, if not creativity, then the other virtues, attitudes, skills, or dispositions that are required by that level job. For example, attention, punctuality, a sense of responsibility and commitment--even though it's not a creative job you should care about it in order to do it right. One might again forecast a climate where there was tremendous turnover and instability in jobs, no unionization or a low level of unionization, few explicit rules and criteria, protections and rights, few explicitly recognized responsibilities the employer owes to the employee, etc. In that kind of a cultural climate or ethos, how are we going to get the kinds of punctuality, the kind of sense of responsibility for doing even simple tasks well out of that level of the work force? Are we simply going to have to tolerate it as a society? Are we simply going to say we can't overcome alienation and we're going to have to tolerate a good deal of coercive monitoring of that level of the work force? And also tolerate a lot of shabby work from those low level technicians and low level service personnel?

Wirth: That goes way back to one of the first things you said that O'Toole talked about years ago. While a lot of work may be moving the way Frank was saying, we're keeping the whole population in school longer. To what extent that means less satisfaction with what used to satisfy people, it builds in an interesting conflict. Now, one way to discipline is to use what Marx called the Reserve Army of the unemployed--you have so many out there that can't get employment that people on the job will tow the mark. But then you pay the price for all the unemployment.

Jennings: If you really get the polarization, so that the traditional middle class that industrial capitalism has produced thus far doesn't

exist in neo-capitalistic society, you're going to lose at that bottom level for minorities, ethnic groups, immigrants, etc. You're probably going to lose one of the key psychological bases of the work ethic, namely, the promise of upward social mobility, for oneself maybe but especially for one's children. If I understand it correctly, the traditional immigrant working class groups placed a tremendous value on their present sacrifice for the future upward mobility of their children. If our society eliminates that as a reality and if people perceive it as no longer a reality, that is going to be a very important motivation that will have been taken away.

Pratzner: That was a big motivation in the early part of this century for mainly European immigrants in this country. I'm not so sure it's the same today for South Americans, Cubans, Hispanics, Mexican-Americans, and Blacks in the U.S. For example, I'm told that in many Mexican-American families, for women or girls to aspire to high levels of education in high school is not always thought of as a very positive kind of thing. In many groups, the idea of sons or daughters to do better than father is an accepted value. It is my understanding that this is not the case in Mexican-American families. For daughters, in particular, to exceed their fathers in things like accomplishments and education level is not generally sanctioned or supported. For the immigrants and minorities of today in the U.S., we certainly need to look at their value systems in terms of the future in vocational education.

Seidman: I've got a question apropos to a lot of what we've discussed the last 15 to 20 minutes. If indeed we're losing the middle class, we have the bottom, bimodal social classes working and the working environment

developing. We have minorities on the rise relative to the Caucasian population. The point is that there has never been the Marxist proletariat developing because unions did, literally did, in the early twentieth century succeed in developing a working middle class. I think you have this bimodal work force where most people are have-nots.

Jennings: It seems to me that the polarization we're talking about might not be something that would make Marx celebrate at this point. He might say: "It took longer than I thought but I told you so." He might say that. But he also would probably say, "I'm a bit of a technological determinist. I wanted the revolution to occur when it was still possible to really democratize the benefits of material affluence and capitalism throughout the working class and when the technological processes still permitted a diversity of work." But being something of a technological determinist, as I think Marx was, to live now and to follow the analysis we've been talking about is to say: "Well, why is there going to be this low level service sector with people who have few prospects for upward social mobility and fewer chances for creativity and involvement in the job? It's even more rote than before. If that is the case, if that is what the technological transformation of capitalism has driven us to, then you might have social unrest, political conflict, and a revolution all right. But is it going to be revolution that is going to lead to the kind of communal, egalitarian vision of Marxism? Not necessarily."

The revolution could be of a much more authoritarian, right wing sort and that shouldn't provoke any celebrations among Marxists. Which makes it all the more important to ask what is the continuing viability

of liberal traditions and values. I mean that very broadly--the Western liberal tradition with its core values of liberty, equality, rights, equality of opportunity, self-development, and justice. What's the continuing viability of those concepts in this future polarized workplace? This is a question that to me makes it all the more important to raise the question raised before: How can we be talking sensibly about the rights and responsibilities workers and employers owe one another?

To talk in that idiom, in effect, says the liberal tradition is still viable. We still can adapt its core values to our present and future realities. Anyone who really was totally pessimistic about these future scenarios would say there's going to be class conflict, a revolution of some kind, probably right wing rather than left wing but authoritarian in either case. That would be a person who wouldn't attempt to answer the question you pose about rights and responsibilities because he would simply say that question is moot--historically moot. There is no point in trying to build that kind of discourse into vocational education because by the time this future arrives that kind of discourse will be obsolete in this society and in the workplace. I don't subscribe to that view but I can imagine a hypothetical critic and crystal ball gazer who might adopt that line of analysis.

Wirth: I think the Reagan wing of that Adam Smith liberal tradition would say: "No problem. We're at a time when if you foster entrepreneurship there will be new Colonel Sanders and they might be brown skinned, black skinned, ghetto capitalists. The marketplace and the chance to fill new needs with new products is where our strength is. Don't sweat it--it will be okay."

I suppose that is one kind of answer. On the other hand, we haven't talked about one element of the population and that is this underclass. That is, they're people who are obsolete by the time they are 20. We seem to be willing to pay the price of letting them operate on the informal crime market which is a very sizeable part of the economy. And, maybe we're willing to bet that that's the way we can handle it in the long run. But there is this possibility that this could even be a growing class as we move toward more intellectually oriented work for large numbers. One answer is it'll take care of itself. Another possibility is that we don't know the answer. We've tried CETA-type answers with no great results. That's a real tough one, the possibility of sharper social antagonisms.

Pratzner: Right now, it seems to me, many things we are doing in education really exacerbate that problem a lot. For example, higher levels of expectations and requirements for students in secondary school and elementary school and for school graduation may increase. School dropout rates, especially among minorities unless we address this problem effectively, are going to increase. Moreover, many who are failing the new teacher competency exams are minority teachers. By cutting off the flow of minority teachers into the teaching profession, by this means we cut off the people who can empathize best with minority students especially in some inner city schools, and we run the risk of making the problem a lot worse. I'm generally optimistic about the longer range, but in the near future I think there are some very difficult problems developing. With a significant shortage of teachers developing nationwide, I don't know how we're going to reverse the decline of minority teachers.

In places like Houston, Texas, for example, the minority population in the Houston School District is over 50%, mostly Hispanic.

Wirth: Here (St. Louis) the Black "minority" is 80% in the city itself.

Seidman: In Chicago, it's in the 70s.

Pratzner: And the number of minority teachers in these cities is not growing. In fact, it may shrink if competency tests for teachers continue to eliminate them. This doesn't bode well for schools and for society in general.

Pratzner: One of the reasons, it seems to me, that education has been so effective for large numbers of people in the past has been because there have been so few job opportunities for really bright women. Education provided good job opportunities for many years for many bright women. Their job opportunities now are incredibly expanded. Fewer of these bright women are going into education because it doesn't pay as well as jobs in other sections or have the social respect of many other types of occupations.

Miller: I was wondering about this bimodal situation in which you have a group of creative people guiding the operation and this other group just following. Isn't the social technical paradigm a chance for these people to get involved in the management part and give them the feeling that they have some control, some creative input into the situation.

Wirth: While we were looking at the happy scenario I mentioned the Bolivar plant as one where you had low educated people who did get involved and as they got involved went beyond how to handle making auto mirrors. They developed their own program for alcoholism. They developed a kind of adult education program in which they could learn multiple

skills. The guy who drove the forklift truck learned how to repair the forklift truck. Also they had their own seminars on childcare and that sort of thing. So when I talked to some of those people on the line they said, "They used to think of us as dumb hillbillies and when they'd bring in their industrial experts from Detroit to look at problems, we'd just sit there quiet and tell them nothing. Now they come to us because they know we're the experts on things." So, maybe it's an overly romantic view, but I think there's the possibility that people in the work force are capable of getting engaged in ways we assumed were impossible.

Would McDonald's and Burger King really warm up to this idea of letting people be part of this--they have a kind of routine of how you move the hamburgers through. I think there is a great hunger in people just because they are people to feel that they have words to say about things. But it's not part of our whole tradition. The bigger corporations, though, are beginning to think about it for survival reasons. I think at the theoretical level that it's possible to tap people in ways we haven't touched so far.

Miller: Haven't Volvo and other companies found it to be a successful option?

Wirth: Yes, but we need to recognize that there are examples that have not gone well, examples that have gone middlin' well, and examples that have gone very well. It's a hard way to go. But, if we take this general idea that we are producing a population that has more formal schooling, then the idea has to have some appeal. We have begun to talk, you know, about an overeducated work force.

Seidman: The United Nations has a concept called "wastage." I think this country has done a masterful job of human wastage. The one resource we have and we should use well is an educated population. We have an overeducated population in which the work does not demand that education. We have to come up with some means of utilizing it. I don't think it's overeducation, I think it's miseducation.

Wirth: I think in part the two models involve a change in attitude. I think in a lot of low skill work if people were treated other than as a replaceable set of names, that they could have a sense that attention is being paid to them. The kind of participation that we're talking about does not necessarily have to involve the high level skills that stretches one to the limit. There are always things that need attention around here and there are alternatives that could be tried.

We have an economist in the Economics Department who says there is going to be less hours of work available and we're probably going to have to think about shared work. You can hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, talk philosophy at night, and work 3 to 4 hours.

Jennings: It also raises a question about the notion of overeducation which, it seems to me, is a very instrumentalist view of work: the goal of education, the purpose of the education. We've overeducated our population because we give them more of an educational experience than is demanded by their 9 to 5 job. Well, is that a problem? From another point of view, one could celebrate that as precisely what education ought to do because the whole self, the whole life, the whole person is not contained in the workplace. The Protestant ethic, if I understand it correctly, holds that a large part or whole sense of self is built

around work or the material rewards and successes achieved from that work. That notion of selfhood may not be dominant now or much longer. It may be that people define themselves more and more in terms of nonwork things. I heard an anecdote that may or may not be true but it's nice anyway. If you ask someone from New York or the east coast who they are or what do they do, they will typically answer in terms of what their job is: "I'm a doctor. I'm a lawyer." If you ask someone from California, they will answer in terms of their hobby: "I'm a jogger. I'm into cycling." The extent to which self is defined by work or by other things is an interesting notion. Why should we worry about education that spills over beyond the Protestant work ethic notion of self?

Seidman: Our attitude toward education is what it is today because that is what education has been thought as. That's the problem. It's defined as a vocational orientation except for the few who see it for its own sake. Most don't define it that way. More and more to the consternation of people who believe in a liberal arts education, the university structure is becoming more and more vocationally oriented. That's the purpose of my being here today. As long as you have that orientation, you're going to have the concept of overeducation. If we get rid of that concept, then we're okay. I think that is really what is required. We're going to find that we're not going to be able to live with the concept of vocational orientation toward education.

Jennings: I guess I'm worried about the other direction if we continue to take the concept seriously. Then one course of action that seems to be called for is to cut back on the amount of education that we're giving these people whom we feel will not be able to be in any kind of demanding

job. Keep them happy, don't teach them stuff that will make them question their world or whatever. Except for the fact that Huxley talked about doing it with genetics in biology, it's the educational version of Huxley's Brave New World. People have their own little niche. Keep their mental horizons conforming with that niche so that they won't be unhappy.

Pratzner: I don't think we engage in a lot of education "for its own sake." It is more difficult, in seems to me, to behave effectively as an individual in society. There are a lot of issues--social, political, and economic--to deal with that are very complex and require problem solving, critical thinking, and other skills that are supposed to be among the outcomes of 12 years of schooling. Whether one calls that education for its own sake or education for work, I think there is a need for education other than for the job. It's also hard to imagine that we overeducate students today.

Miller: What about your idea about we're not overeducating but miseducating? If we're gearing toward a specific job and ignoring a greater picture that life is more than work, are we talking about changing our educational objectives? But I want to get back to the function--when I was in school, I was college bound. I really wasn't being educated for a specific job. They allowed me a certain latitude: "Oh, you're going to learn about great literature and stuff just for the sake of that." Someone else in a different track was being educated for a specific job outcome. They were going to be a secretary. I'm wondering if it's been a function of some kids got it and some kids didn't.

Rubin: The idea of a public education, Jefferson's perhaps, was that we were educating people to be citizens, to make decisions about who was going to help run the country, etc. It was really with the industrial revolution that we went to the idea that education was for business and what business or management wanted in a certain kind of worker. So, it almost seems now that we need to be going back the other way because everything is so complex, how can one make decisions about things?

Pratzner: But isn't there quite a bit of functional illiteracy in our society?

Rubin: But at this point, considering if you are willing, one could find enough things on television or the radio to explain things so you don't necessarily have to be able to read to function in this society. You can find all kinds of ways to survive in this society.

Seidman: You're talking about quality of life. Is there some moral obligation on our part to guarantee a certain level of quality of life to everybody? I think that there is implicit in this whole attitude of education that you have a right to a quality of life well above that survival level.

Wirth: I think a case could be made that the main goal for education in our society has been to help you get ahead in life. When you come right down to it, that's the expectation. I know in my family, I was the first one to go to college. I wasn't questioning much. I happened to be interested in books but the main goal was an accumulation of credentials. To take a more optimistic point of view, there might be a growing awareness that it is more practical to pay more attention to quality questions now. Could we ever get to the point that people at work would

raise the question: "Is what we're working on harmful to human life or harmful to the environment?" It is kind of mind-boggling to think that people would get around to raising those questions. The people in Norway said, "Well, the truth is when we're in a time of recession, you can't raise those questions. You have to hang on to keep surviving." But people begin to see there's a practical dimension to raising questions about the quality of life. It might become the optimistic scenario. Until now, we have had an onslaught style of growth and the assumption that growth is what the ball game is all about. The alternative is something more ecological, some sense that all the pieces are related. We need a generation that is more sensitive to that.

Miller: I was wondering if the Hawthorne effect would be what the socio-technical paradigm really provides--somebody to listen to you, somebody cares what you think--

Wirth: You mean like it works--

Miller: Just something new that they brought in and you change the lights in the room, the worker thinks well at least they care.

Seidman: It argues for what's the long-term benefit. Is there a long-term benefit? The Hawthorne effect says there's a temporary benefit; is there a long-term benefit to the socio-technical paradigm?

Wirth: I think it's too early to tell. I guess Frank is betting there's some chance of that. But, let's take Anheiser-Busch which is the one I happen to be closest to recently. A lot of the companies have moved in that direction when they're in trouble--recession times in the auto industry--times like that. But here is Anheiser-Busch, who is number one. And the young August Busch is bringing in his organization and development

people who are oriented that way. In the new plants, he's saying that's the way to go. That's just one piece of evidence. Some of the big ones are presumably committing themselves to making a major effort in this direction. I know that there are conflicts at the top. I think within General Motors, E. L. "Dutch" Landon and Howard Carlsen are in the new mood, while Red Smith, the President of GM, is skeptical. So, it's still moot. In the unions you have the same split.

There is a lot of disillusionment in the unions with worker participation because it gets perverted. I know a nurse who is head of new infant care in Barnes (Hospital). They brought in Quality Circles and she was all excited about it a year or two ago. The nurses were coming up with ideas, but management hadn't been part of the training. I wanted her to come in and talk to a class and she said, "Oh, that's all over. They started using the Quality Circle to give directives they wanted to run through the Quality Circle. People said, 'It's the same old game.'" Our old habits and old needs are such that the new language is going to be used in contradiction with the practice leading to disillusionment. In education, we're used to trend swings. We go through the swing towards discipline and subject mastery. Then we go back and say, "Let's have concern about affective life and put the students in circles." So, when the man comes around he wants to see everybody in circles. But unless people have internalized the values and made them their own, they become victims to new administrative ploys. I know that's going on and it will discredit some of what we're talking about. Maybe it's a hope, but I think there'll be some staying power to it.

Pratzner: I think a lot of it depends on the CEO. I think August Busch is one example, and probably there are others: Harmon at Bolivar Tennessee plant is a similar CEO. Hewlett-Packard is another instance where both of the men who started that firm were believers in such principles, as participative management, human dignity, and individual pride in work. They were convinced that greater involvement of the workers was in the interest both of the corporation as well as the individuals. In that sense, I think Hewlett-Packard is a place where it really seems to have worked. It looks great on paper; and in fact, on the shop floor, it looks like it's something that's operational.

Wirth: I think there's learning going on as we move in that direction. For example, we had a guy on campus from Chrysler Training Program named Woody Perez. Chrysler is starting a new operation in the Fenton plant outside St. Louis. Iacocca brought in something he called Productivity Circles. He said let's not play any games about "socio-technical and employee participation." We've got to have productivity circles that are going to increase the productivity and the quality. In that sense, he was up front about it. And so, they brought in this Woody Perez to conduct training programs before they had the start up of the new operation. He is a pretty tough-minded guy. He said he would not come into a plant unless top management would also go through the training program. At Barnes Hospital where quality circles got discredited, the management never became part of it. They introduced the circle idea but management was perverting it all the time because they had never internalized it. So, I think there's some kind of a learning process going on. Everybody should be in it, or nobody.

Pratzner: I think my own personal explanation why it never worked was there was never any real management support. It was just tolerated.

Wirth: And it was threatening to people who had old style values. It's unsettling. There are a lot of ways to sabotage it, maybe not consciously.

Miller: You talk about different worlds of work and people having different working styles, abilities, and preferences for work. If the function of vocational education might be to match those up, in other words there are people who would function better under a socio-technical format and there are people who just want to put in their 4 to 8 hours, go home, and do something; they have no real interest but this is okay. That is all they really want in life. It is hard to imagine someone feeling like that but I suppose there are.

Wirth: That's showed up over and over again.

Seidman: They're socialized by their parents to think that way.

Miller: Should we be in the business of trying to match people to situations? There are a myriad of possibilities out there.

Seidman: Of course in vocational education, one of the basic components is career counseling. Career counseling could give a socio-technical versus conventional paradigm of the workplace because it is their function.

You could show the world of work was presenting various options to people, not just in occupations but in the actual work environment. If the same occupation could occur in several environments, then it obviously would be incumbent upon any counseling or education programs that teach about the world of work to inform students about the match between themselves and the different environments and which would fit best. The question though becomes what happens if somebody could not function well

in a vertical organization but the occupation never has bought into a socio-technical paradigm.

Miller: Then I'm wondering if our function is to provide the kids with the skills to change that situation.

Seidman: Right. That's the big question.

Wirth: At this Baldwinsville plant they're hiring in a new force now. It had been a Schlitz plant so they had some Schlitz workers. But they did a big testing program in other Budweiser operations. They were trying to find people with values that would be compatible with the new style. There was a deliberate effort to find people who were in sync with what they call the corporate culture, values of the new culture.

Seidman: What did they find?

Wirth: They found the people they wanted. And it evidently is a real winner on all the bottom line stuff. That's one of the reasons Augie Busch is pushing it. On absenteeism, on turnover, breakage, I mean it's outscoring all the other ones.

Seidman: One of the criterion for employment was a match between the potential employee and the new work style. Many people could be rejected because they didn't actually fit.

Miller: This also occurred when a Japanese car company came over here to open a plant. They interviewed all these people to determine if they had the correct attitudes to be workers at this plant. They were screened on the basis of their attitudes and whether or not they could handle participatory management.

Rubin: In most corporations people at the management level tend to be shifted from one location to another within the company as they move up.

How are they dealing with being transferred between the two kinds of plants that they're running?

Wirth: The truth is I don't know. I do know that they have now a spectrum of Anheiser-Busch plants. Of 11 major breweries, 3 of them are about like Baldwinsville while some of them are very traditional. What they do is they keep their eye open for signs of readiness. And they won't try moving in this direction unless there's something about management, maybe the union, and technology that gives them a feeling that they can have the right conditions. I think the Anheiser-Busch situation poses one of the challenges for vocational education. Corporations are going to have different styles of management. The participatory model will clearly be the minority for a long time. Yet, I think it can be a fairly powerful force.

Seidman: At the worker level, what the scenario is "You're flexible on the job, you better be flexible off the job because you're not going to be holding your job perhaps that long unless you have mobility." If I'm mobile, I may be moving out of a socio-technical paradigm or conventional, more orthodox paradigm into the opposite. We've got a problem of transition: skills of transition, skills of handling the stress, a need for people to be educated to be able to handle both environments. It's nice to match but I don't think we can assume that the socio-technical paradigm will be the minority or that workers are going to be jumping between the two. They may or may not be moving between the two, but we've got a job of educating them to handle various work environments. Matching might work the first time but it won't work after the loss of the first job probably. It's unlikely.

Jennings: To what extent are we talking about skills or the kinds of things that can in fact be taught in any imaginable vocational education program? To what extent are we talking about more basic personality traits? I mean we've mentioned that we have to help the students learn how to fit. Does that mean if you're shy, inarticulate, and don't like to speak in public that you won't fit in well in that kind of workplace so you should be counseled into some other kind of workplace? If that's what we're talking about, then I wonder how to use vocational education programs to make a basic personality that is in some ways inflexible, unadaptive, or maladaptive to some environments more adaptive if it's basic personality we're talking about. Now, if it's something a good deal less deep rooted than that, then I'm with you.

Seidman: I'm operating under the assumption of some thinking done by researchers we fund that you can take students and educate them in problem-solving skills and transition skills to confront the change from one position to another within the job, the loss of the job, or getting a new job plus the essential basic academic and technical skills. The question of character or personality traits is one that I think is endemic to education. Education programs, regardless of vocational education or any other kind of education, naturally fall into certain areas. But I believe you can be educated to deal with transitions.

Jennings: Is it being done now or are you saying it needs to be done more in the future because right now we're focusing too much on hammering nails?

Seidman: It needs to be done. That's why we're starting to reconceptualize vocational education. We're developing an employment

core and an academic core and now we're dealing with how they overlap and who is responsible to teach what. By the end of it we want kids who either can go on and further their education or get a job.

Pratzner: Who are these "we"?

Seidman: The State Board of Education. The 17-member board has approved outcome statements in six areas: social studies, language arts, math, health and PE, fine arts, and basic education. The purpose of the statements is to legislate academic requirements in Illinois. We're hoping that no longer will 4 years of English be required but at the end of high school a kid has to be able to do this kind of stuff. Those are the outcome statements. Since vocational education is not included in any of those outcome statements, we have been developing a response to fit within those outcomes. Vocational education is going to show how we fit and what we can do for the rest of kindergarten through 12th-grade education and what they can do for us. And we're going to convince them to share responsibility. In fact, the state superintendent is talking more and more that vocational education is a part of this and sees its value in helping to achieve academic outcomes as well as its own employability function. The research I was talking about is being done by people at SIU-Carbondale, Harry Daniels and Joe Karmos. I am trying to put this whole thing into reconceptualizing the kindergarten through 12 system.

Wirth: There might be another dimension to it, too. If we just use a crude dichotomy between a specific training tradition and something like conceptual curiosity. I wrote about a school in Norway in which they had a steering committee with representatives. They changed the style

of work and brought vocational education teachers onto these ships that were moving into this new style of work so they could internalize the new style. So, it's the difference between a learning climate versus a training climate. What different ways can we get students involved in conceptual curiosity? I think that becomes an important question.

Jennings: That helps clarify a question. Before you were talking about the need to help students become adaptable, assuming that in fact during their careers they move between different types of workplaces. If we predict that they are going to have to move eventually from authoritarian, hierarchical workplaces to horizontal, integrative, and participatory ones we need to give them the flexibility and adaptability to do that. Now, if we introduce the notion that in some way the form of the learning place is related to the content of the learning that goes on, how can we in a single learning place reproduce a microcosm of the variety and diversity of the workplace structures that students are going to encounter? It seems impossible to do. So, aren't we left in a position of really not so much giving students the flexibility to move equally well into an authoritarian or a democratic workplace, but having to make a choice through the nature of our learning and learning places to inculcate either democratic or authoritarian expectations? If we choose to inculcate democratic expectations in the students, we need to face up to the fact that when they go into the workplace they are going to be forced to move back and forth but aren't going to be as happy in the authoritarian institutions as in the democratic ones. And they may pressure the authoritarian ones for changes in the democratic direction with all that implies. Now I, myself, find that scenario a hopeful one

and one I support. But I also think that if you were to state it either in the Illinois Board of Education or anywhere else publicly in those terms, it would be a highly controversial proposition.

Seidman: The implications are exactly what we're talking about today, what the people are doing at Southern Illinois University, and what Pam is doing. My guess is we are going to force the acceptance of the democratic attitude. We will encounter pressure from the worker at the workplace to change when something is not acceptable. Do you not think though that giving students experience in both types of environment is part of the process of educating them?

Miller: In fact, that does happen all the time because every classroom is a different order. Teacher A is a democratic-oriented teacher with learner objectives and all that kind of stuff. Teacher B is a highly authoritarian teacher. Kids who walk in assess that teacher's style, adapt to it, and survive.

Jennings: I take your point but it seems to me that there may be more than one level to what we're talking about. As you go through a school, you encounter a variety of teachers, teaching styles, and personalities that in fact will help you to become flexible enough to deal with different bosses and supervisors. The teaching staff may give you a nice cross section of all the different personalities of kinds of supervisors you're likely to encounter, but still the school can't give you a cross section of all the different types of institutions that you're going to encounter. So I don't think you and I are really disagreeing--I was talking at the institutional level; you're talking at the universal level.

Wirth: It seems to me that more vocational learning may have to go on in the workplaces because vocational schools can't possibly duplicate this rapidly changing technology. People who are actually confronting how to deal with robotization, for example, are the sources that kids could best learn from. To what extent does vocational education have to think about how to get more of it going on out there rather than in the school building? I'm sure that's been thought about before.

Seidman: That is a concern. Vocational education has its work study co-op programs and the big problem is what's being pushed. Those programs are becoming more and more alive now because vocational programs don't have current generation technology. We're being forced to go to industry and they're being forced to cooperate with the schools because they want kids that can work with the technology. You can get multiple work environments if the concept of the work experience component is sending kids out of the schools and into the workplace more.

Wirth: So the work study tradition gives you a base from which to do more of that?

Seidman: We have a precedent but not a precedent of students working in multiple types of work environments and learning from them. In most schools, there is no attempt to try to find two or three electronics firms in the vicinity with very different attitudes toward the relationship between management and labor or management and worker. And essentially what we have to do now is to start the inculcation of something different than the vertical, authoritarian model.

Pratzner: That is still one thing you can recommend to teachers in a very practical sort of way. Look for those kinds of firms in the community for work sites. That is what I'm getting at indirectly.

Jennings: Also, don't we have the issue of the education of the vocational educators? To what extent are the people teaching these courses aware of the kinds of issues we have been talking about this morning? These concepts have to be a part of their training and reading.

Seidman: How comfortable do you think a current vocational educator who is used to teaching the concept of electronics as a skill to kids is going to feel when he is told he has to start teaching other values such as flexibility and adaptability?

Pratzner: The electronics course is taught more like an academic course than other vocational courses. There is straight lecture followed by students going into the lab to experiment and test hypotheses from the lecture--it is taught much like physics and chemistry are taught. Auto mechanics typically is taught in a much different way. Business and office skills are much more hands on. In vocational education programs the opportunities are there, I think, to provide students with practice and opportunities to develop these other skills--flexibility, adaptability, etc.--perhaps better than more academically oriented studies.

Jennings: This reminds me of a question and an issue that often comes up in discussions of the teaching of professional ethics. In law schools, for example, the debate is over do you have specific legal ethics courses or do you follow the pervasive method which is to try to integrate a little ethics into every course? Here the question would be--the parallel

question would be--do you see these social skills, social technical flexibility type objectives, as being something that is added to the vocational curriculum in the form of separate courses or do you follow the pervasive method and try to stick it in everywhere?

Seidman: That infusion--that is kind of how I visualized it but that's the thing that must be brought up.

Jennings: There certainly are objections to the pervasive method in the teaching of ethics. There may be parallel objections to the infusion approach in vocational education which might be worth studying.

Pratzner: When asked to add something to their course, teachers say there is no way that I can add anything else to this course unless you tell me what I can take out of the course. There are not a lot of guidelines to go by.

Jennings: True, I understand that; but going the other way, the point you make in your paper: they may not always be repairing carburetors. They could have problem-solving skills that are more general so they can apply those skills to the context of repairing the carburetor or a computer or whatever. Should vocational education try to teach them specific skills which may or may not be marketable or should we rather think of education as giving the second order skills and then they learn the specifics of repairing X on the job? That seems to cut in the direction of having some measure of separate treatment for these things and not totally infusing them into the context of specifics hands-on work they're doing.

AFTERNOON SESSION

Miller: What we more or less ended up with earlier was a variety of interpretations of the future world of work. We seem to be charged with the task of preparing people to enter a variety of work environments on a continuum between the scientific management model and the socio-technical paradigm. Given this task I think we should consider what kind of ethical beliefs or thinking skills might be needed by the worker facing this continuum.

Jennings: Could I introduce a distinction or a couple of distinctions that are fairly commonly used in discussion of professional ethics? First, is there anything we can use from the conceptual framework that is commonly employed in professional ethics for the purpose of trying to make sense out of vocational ethics? That framework is based on a distinction between role obligations and generic ethical responsibilities, between the ethical obligations one has qua human being and those one has qua doctor, social worker, lawyer, or whatever. A fairly common starting point in professional ethics is the notion that as human beings, as members of society, we have many general ethical obligations and responsibilities. There is a general ethic that covers the basic human rights and human duties of all people. Where professional ethics comes in then is to try to understand those special duties or special obligations that are incumbent upon people who play a particular role and then for one reason or another have some special power or control over other people. Professionals have particular power over other people. They have autonomy and power that is special to them by dint of their expert training and knowledge and by the fact that society allows

individuals who have been certified in certain ways as professionals to do certain things. They have peer review but also a fair amount of autonomy from outside social and governmental control. So if you're a doctor you have special skills and special knowledge, and are put in a position most people aren't put in. Namely, people turn to you for help, comfort, cure, and so forth. Because of those special features of your role, what are your special ethical responsibilities, rights, and duties and so on?

Arguments in professional ethics have to do with what happens when professional obligations and general moral duties collide or conflict. Are professionals allowed to have their role obligations override their general obligations in society? This is, I believe, a fairly common general conceptual framework that people start with in many discussions in professional ethics.

Miller: In terms of professional ethics, are we talking about someone in a position of power instead of one who is not? Are we looking at a person in power to make sure that this relationship does not become abusive?

Jennings: Well, that's part of it.

Miller: What I'm wondering is if this model of professional ethics has any applicability to a situation in which there is not someone in a power position and someone in a dependent position. For example, interactions between people on an assembly line.

Jennings: Well, that's precisely the question I want to pose. To what extent can we say that vocational ethics is distinct from the general ethical responsibilities that we all have as human beings? Can we approach

vocational ethics as a species of role ethics? That is to say, if you are a worker on an assembly line, you are in a particular role. It's not just a question of power. Obviously it raises different substantive issues than the doctor-patient relationship but you still might be able to talk about the special role obligations that are created for you just because you are occupying that role, performing that function, or have a certain skill or position. But offhand I'm not sure what these special role responsibilities would be in the vocational area. Certainly there are many, many ethical issues concerning interpersonal relationships in the workplace but it seems to me that most of these issues can be adequately dealt with by general ethical theories of wide applicability. Whether ethics is adequately taught in vocational education is another matter. Only if there's something special, some undealt with remainder that attaches to the vocational role or a special situation in the workplace that isn't covered by the general morality would we, strictly speaking, be dealing with a specific vocational ethic. Only that would be in any way analogous to specific professional ethics like medical ethics or legal ethics or what have you. I haven't thought through the problem; I only pose it as a possible thing to discuss. I'm not sure that there is an analogy between professional ethics and its structure on the one hand and vocational ethics on the other. I'm not sure the professional ethics area provides us with a very helpful paradigm for exploring the vocational ethics area.

Miller: I'd like to give an example that is lauded in the literature as being basic to the American work ethic, that is, a sense of industry, doing a good job. In terms of two different environments, one in which

the socio-technical paradigm is operating and one in which the scientific management is in operation, what does doing a good job mean under those two conditions? For example, punctuality might be an example of a commitment to the task under the scientific management model. Showing up on time, being there from 9 to 5 would be an indication of commitment to task. Under the socio-technical paradigm you may expect the person to stay until the task is completed no matter how long it takes. Maybe it takes 15 minutes, maybe it takes overnight work. The basic attitude is the same but how it's translated is different.

Seidman: I think we should test your proposition to see if there's anything there. One of the ways we could test it is to take a tenet of the conventional work ethic, if we could define some of the basic ones, and ask: First, is that part of a general moral obligation or is it part of vocational obligation?

Jennings: I think that the distinction between general ethical principles versus ethical principles that are role specific is a useful and a helpful distinction. I haven't quite been able to think of examples of the latter type. Let me give an account of the thing you mentioned from the point of view of applied ethical theory or ethical justification. It's true as a historical or sociological observation that part of the so-called work ethic has been that it's a good thing to do a good job. What doing a good job means is a function of the setting you're talking about. In one case the question of showing up on time, punctuality, might just mean working 9 to 5. In another, your sense of time on the job is different. In either case why should you be on time? Why is that ethically important? I can think of at least two arguments. One, it's ethically important for

you to show up on time because you have made a promise. You made some kind of contract or promise with your employer and a part of that is you will be here from 9 to 5. You will give a day's work for a day's pay; it's unethical to shirk your work hours. It is a species of breaking a promise--a basic paradigm of an ethically unjustifiable act unless there are special reasons to justify it. That would be one argument of why it is an ethically good thing to come to work on time and it is an ethically bad thing not to. Another account of the same would be: "Look, if you show up late, you're burdening your fellow workers with extra work and you're not doing your share and so forth. You have certain moral relationships, ties, commitments, and responsibilities to your fellow workers, the people beside you on the line. The workplace is such that when you goof off they have an extra burden. That's not fair. You're being unjust to them and you're violating the moral ties you have as a fellow worker." So there's another kind of argument why it's ethical to be on time and unethical not to be. Now, the question then is, is this just an application of general ethical considerations to a specific setting or is this something special to the setting? It seems obvious to me that in this case it's the former. It's a matter of general ethical consideration that we keep our promises and our contracts. It's a matter of general ethical consideration that we have obligations and responsibilities to the people that we work and share work with and we're not supposed to let them down without a good reason. They have just expectations that we'll hold up our end. When we fail to do that we have done something that is morally blameworthy. So, again it seems to me that general ethics apply to a vocational setting. Special vocational

ethics are not involved in this case unless you can think of an example where punctuality would be morally important above and beyond the kind of general accounts that could be given. Maybe you would say that with firemen, policemen, or a surgeon being late involves more than breaking a promise or letting your co-worker down. If it's a matter of life and death, then you're beginning to get into the area that I call a role-specific ethic rather than a general ethic applied to a role. Maybe all this is too fine a distinction, I don't know. I'm just trying to run through for you what I think applied philosophers who talk about professional ethics would say about this.

Seidman: In drawing the distinction that you've drawn though, let's take firemen and policemen. All you've really said is that it's particularly important that they be punctual, that it's not a special ethic they have that's different qualitatively.

Jennings: It is qualitatively different. The thing that makes it so special and urgent grows out of that particular role. Nobody who is not in the role of policemen would find themselves in the situation of special moral urgency because it's inherent in what we call police service.

Seidman: Punctuality exists as a general obligation. It also exists in a different category as a role obligation for certain occupations. So it just doesn't have the same meaning, the same definition; they can coexist that way and be part of two different categories.

Wirth: Is it possible, are there features of this current work ethic readily identifiable? You mentioned punctuality. Is there a formal statement on the work ethic somewhere? We know there's one that just

came out of the Puritan tradition. Is there one written down somewhere? Is there a work ethic written down somewhere in vocational education?

Miller: Not that I'm aware of.

Wirth: The state of Illinois does not have a sheet of paper that says this is the work ethic?

Pratzner: There are lots and lots of surveys of employers that point out these kinds of things. Things of quality--

Miller: Commitment to job, dedication, follows through, and makes the extra effort, punctual.

Pratzner: If you're reliable.

Miller: Yes, so, we've got functional and adaptive skills. Adaptive skills are being tactful, outgoing, a fast learner, having a positive attitude, self-prompting, motivated, a good appearance, a good presentation.

Wirth: Well, if you take those two polar models at work, there are differences in what would be expected to do quality work. Under the more traditional model, I think that tends to mean quality expected by someone who supervises you. Again, to take the other model as an ideal type, the move is towards people who do the work also do the quality controls. There's more obligation under the second one to have involvement in monitoring the standards and maybe changing them rather than having them changed for you. I think that the general trend has been one of the results of computerization. The monitoring of quality is closer to the place where the work is done; more and more quality controls are monitored by the people who do it which is a shift from the other model. I don't

quite know what that means as far as ethics but there is a difference in the expectations I think.

Pratzner: I think the same is true for a lot of these so-called interpersonal skills that seem to be more quality circle kind of operation incentives.

Miller: Let's look at loyalty as being something valuable. How would that be assessed in these two different models? Loyalty to who, to what?

Jennings: A philosopher named Michael Walzer has written about the concept of obligation. He makes a distinction that might be pertinent to these two different workplaces we've identified. He talks about the difference between vertical obligation and horizontal obligation. By that he means if you enter a relationship of vertical obligation, you're entering into a relationship of an agreement that you make with someone who is in some sense your superior. Hence, the vertical imagery. And, it's the way political theorists have often talked about the relationship between the people and the government. A social contract sort of notion--we all get together and agree that this government will have political authority. This authority comes from the agreement; our obligation to obey the law comes ultimately from the consent of the people--that kind of philosophical, fictional kind of social contract idea. That's vertical obligations. Most of the accounts of that kind of obligation say it's an obligation generated by the fact that you have voluntarily entered into an agreement. The further question is then why do you enter into the agreement? The answer usually is in terms of self-interest. I enter into agreement so that I can be protected or I can get the benefits of social order that would be impossible without such an agreement, laws,

or the state. It is an egoistic or self-interested orientation on the part of the individual that lies at the bottom of this theory of vertical obligation.

If you contrast that with horizontal obligation, Walzer believes that instead of self-interest lying at the bottom of horizontal obligation there is the sense of community or solidarity or loyalty. Horizontal obligations are the obligations that we owe to our peers that grow out of our social interactions and cooperative interactions with those peers. By definition when you have an obligation, a moral or legal obligation, it's a limitation on your freedom. You just can't do anything you want to do and still live up to your obligation. So, on the one hand, you impose limitations on yourself by entering into contractual agreements with those above you out of self-interest. On the other hand, you impose self-limitations on yourself by entering into communal relationships with your peers and get horizontal obligations out of that.

The obvious parallel that is striking about all this is that the authoritarian workplace is marked by vertical obligations which are ultimately grounded in individual self-interest. The democratic workplace is marked by the existence of horizontal moral obligations among peers grounded not in individual self-interest but in those interests shared in common. Those bonds that exist mutually among them. In the first instance the notion of loyalty doesn't fit very well with that general conception of the nature of obligations or motivations behind them. In the second case, because it's more communal and egalitarian in character, the notion of loyalty has a more natural place in my life. And a similar analysis might be applied to all these virtues you've ticked off under

the rubric of the work ethic because really that's what they are--a list of character virtues. One might go through that list and ask whether the notion of vertical obligation or the notion of horizontal obligation is more amenable to some of those virtues than others. You might very well end up with two lists: a democratic work ethic with certain virtues emphasized and an authoritarian work ethic with other virtues emphasized.

This may help us fine tune the notion that we've inherited historically in our culture as "the work ethic." So much has been added to it since it was classically expressed by Benjamin Franklin. Today our list of virtues is a sociological and historical accretion, a hodge-podge. There is no reason to believe that the list logically hangs together or is internally consistent. And for that reason, there is no good reason to think that the list will survive to apply across the board to all these various types of workplaces that we've been discussing, particularly our two different paradigm types. So there's no reason to start out with the expectation that there is a single work ethic that is going to be equally applicable to the authoritarian and the democratic workplace and can be taught in the vocational education programs.

Wirth: We've polarized it in terms of good and bad guy but it seems to me that what we're calling the democratic workplace in its purer form would be worker-owner ownership because the obligations would be to that community where power is equalized. In that sort of real-world industrial model where you have private ownership and management, we tend to talk more about workplace democracy. In the model Blueston advocated, he argued you should keep some formal contractual relationships within the vertical. For example, you would be loyal to the union and the contract

that it negotiated with management. You would have some of these contractual obligations to management that were part of work in general. Within the parameters where participation had a reality about it, where there was some power to make changes, etc., you'd be more within the horizontal thing. In that case, you'd be asking people at work to be aware of their traditional relations to the union for certain parts of work, sorting out when they should adhere to that, and how they were going to carve out certain areas in which there was autonomy that were less rule-bound. There is an order of complexity there where you would be expecting people to have sensitivity to both those axes. Whereas in a worker-owned industry, which is a growing phenomenon, it would be pure democratic.

Seidman: Do you talk about the obligations to one's self that exists? When an individual worker comes in conflict produced by his or her values with those of a peer or by a superior, is that a different obligation? Or is that within one of these two types of obligations? I've had conflict between my personal stance, my principles, and what I'm being told to do either by horizontal or vertical relationships.

Jennings: Well, I don't think that all life is covered by the concept of obligations. There's always going to be the possibility that only a part of our moral experience is caught up in the obligations we have taken on. There are always other moral values and goods which are not part of our obligations at all.

On the other hand, if we were to talk about specific cases of conflict, moral conflict, we'd be able to sort out what might handle it best. I can think of examples of conflict in which you have conflicts

between the obligations you have toward your fellow workers, the horizontal kind, versus vertical obligations you have as a citizen to the society at large, to the public interest. It's a 4 by 4 matrix so there's all the combinations: you have conflicts between the vertical obligations to management and the ones to society. In some cases if you're told by management: "Dump this toxic junk in the river!", you're going to have a moral conflict of a multi-faceted and multi-dimensional nature. To obey management is a prima facie obligation because you've entered into a contract with them but, on the other hand, you have (in this case stronger) obligations as a citizen not to break the environmental laws. So, I don't think there's a general answer to your question. It's something that has to be sorted out on a case by case basis. But certainly one shouldn't think that the concept of obligations is the single concept of ethics that will take care of the whole realm of ethics. That's not the case.

Wirth: One thing that could be part of vocational education would be having students confront the variety of cases where they're presented with these conflict issues. At least so that they'd be sensitive to the nature of the choice: When do I pull the general obligation as a human being and the contractual obligations as a worker? I think a lot of times people aren't consciously aware of what's really going on.

Jennings: Well, I don't want to monopolize this but let me just give you the short version of the Hastings Center position on this. In the work that we did on the study of ethics in higher education (undergraduate and professional school level) we were of course thinking about professional ethics and general ethical duties. We were not thinking

about the special problem of vocational education. For that purpose, our analysis argued that there are certain goals of the teaching of ethics that we thought made sense--were endorsable. They were the development of analytical reasoning skills, expansion of the moral imagination, and what you might call the development of moral perception--that is, the ability to recognize an issue as an ethical issue when it arises rather than just see it as a purely technical without any moral implications to it. Finally, as a goal of the teaching of ethics, the Hastings Center suggests the development of the capacity to tolerate disagreement but at the same time to be able to assert one's own position. That is to say, what one tries to aim at in such an application is neither dogmatism nor wishy-washy relativism, some ground in between. Practical experience has shown in the professional education area that many of those goals are very well served by a careful use of the case study analysis method. Most people who have tried to teach applied and professional ethics courses have found that an attempt to just teach it as a kind of moral philosophy course in pure theory, such as on Socrates, Aristotle, and Kant, does not work effectively. However, discussion of the individual cases, anecdotal or hypothetical, is limited too because students learn to talk about a particular situation in its concreteness and particularity. But, they do not learn one very important reasoning and analytical skill: the capacity to generalize from a given case to understand the basic rules or general principles that are involved in that case, and then see how to apply those rules to cases they have not even encountered or yet imagined.

The reasoning from specific, well understood cases to general principles and back to novel cases again is a kind of tacking back and forth many people think is the educational experience that should be taking place in the teaching of ethics. So, you've got to have both case studies and theory. Theory is there to help students come to grips with the ability to generalize, to abstract from particular cases, to formalize principles, to criticize them, to understand how you can evaluate and assess an ethical claim. Somebody says: "Justice is . . . . Okay, let's argue about that. How do you assess a claim like that?" This is the discipline of ethical theorizing and is part of the course, too.

Wirth: I can see some vague possibility that if we stay with the idea that students might be confronted with these two worlds of work and all the shades in between that cases could be selected in which the choices would be clarified within those two worlds of work. I have hope that we had some examples like the quality of work. A crude example is the obligation to meet the expectations of the boss. Another one is the importance of an attitude, a climate of trust that's a significant quality or feature that distinguishes the newer from the older. Working within an atmosphere of trust, to what extent can we create standards of quality that are going beyond what the boss requires because we discover that if we keep looking at it in our own way, we could reach higher standards? Instead of just staying within the rules, we now have an obligation, our own higher sense of what we can do and can we meet that?

Miller: I'm interested in these basic principles that the student would pick up on. Are these things that they deduce from this concrete experience themselves without somebody structuring it ahead of time?

Jennings: I believe the most effective teaching/learning experience takes place when there really is an interaction between what the course offers and what the student brings to the analysis in terms of moral intuitions or moral values already inculcated from their family life, life experience, and culture. On the one hand, the instructor can give guidance to those intuitions through an understanding of ethical theories. It's the interaction: It's neither passive instruction which is sometimes called values clarification, where the students are just trying to get their own thing out, affirm it, and articulate it, nor is it such active instruction that teachers can lay out all the answers on a complex chart, have students memorize it, and learn to analyze the cases in terms of this chart. That's baloney as far as moral education is concerned because the minute the students leave that classroom they probably throw the chart away. No, I think it must really be an interaction between their intuitions and more sophisticated considerations.

Miller: Through opportunity and teaching that the kid will eventually come to realize?

Jennings: If you're saying that the outcome of this dynamic process I'm describing is usually about the same in every class if it's done right, then I agree. I think, in fact, that we at least can rule certain kinds of rules and principles out. I'm not sure that any philosophical theory in ethics has yet given us the definitive set of principles and values. But I think moral philosophy does make some intellectual progress in the sense that it does at least rule certain kinds of things out. It is now possible to show that taken from classical philosophical literature is the position of Thrasymachus in Plato's Republic where he in effect says:

"Might makes right." I mean that's a proposition in moral philosophy that you can show is simply not true. The people who hold it, if they are willing to engage in reasonable discourse, will eventually admit that they don't believe it either. Because they wouldn't want to live as though they believed it. I do think we at least have parameters pretty well in mind for what constitutes morally acceptable behavior and what falls outside it. The hard cases are always in the gray area and that's what makes case studies most interesting as a pedagogical tool. Again, it seems to me that you don't introduce hard cases on the first day or first week of the course. You build toward them by using simpler, more clear-cut cases and instances. But eventually, you do want to get to the hard cases. One of the nice things about the teaching of ethics is that it doesn't really lend itself to highly doctrinaire modes of teaching because the teacher isn't ever going to be able to say: "I have the right answer." Finally, in these complex gray cases the educational experience itself is wrestling with questions and difficult answers with which reasonable people, reasonable teachers, and reasonable students can disagree. That kind of course does not lend itself to true-false exams, etc.

Wirth: There's kind of some agreement on general behaviors that have to be adhered to to make joint action possible. People are capable of recognizing those in the main. I suppose you always get those gray areas. But that may be part of the style. To what extent are you going to have a code of ethics, that is, would the state be more comfortable with a list: "Okay, for the new work this is it. For the old work . . . ." Or, is it attaching some importance to the process people have skill in?

Seidman: When you talk about voc ed, you're talking about a humongous number of theoretically discrete occupations. Divided into five areas, five discrete occupational perceptions theoretically: business, health occupations, home ec, agriculture, and industrial. Is this a generic problem across the board or are we talking about some that have role obligations for example? Ethics in certain occupations but not in those other occupational areas. We were starting to get into something of an interesting perception if you admit there's more to ethics than obligations that exist at the same order as the conflict of obligations. What are those other components of ethics? We have to teach a sense of obligation. What else do you deal with in ethics at that same order and then take on the vertical or horizontal axis that would be in a sense the continuum of the socio-technical, authoritarian, and democratic authoritarian workplace. Then look at all the cells of that. How do I handle this theoretically, irrespective of the occupation? As a student, any one of those occupations I'm interested in is going to fall within one of the cells theoretically, I guess. And, I'm curious what the other aspects of ethics there are beyond the obligation? We've correctly identified my problem with obligation. What other higher order of ethics is beyond that? Is justice one of them or is that within?

Jennings: There isn't a consensus of terminology that I can report from the philosophical literature, various thinkers use these terms in different ways. But I think when Walzer introduced the concept of horizontal obligation, he was trying to take a concept--obligation--and broaden it. But I don't think he succeeded in broadening it so much that it encompasses all of ethics. But he certainly did broaden it if obligation

is used in his sense to encompass things like loyalty, I think. But if you just stick with the classical conception of obligation, where duty is derived from voluntary agreements we've entered into, then there's a whole set of moral notions that lie outside the realm of obligation. All of the things that are supererogatory above and beyond the call of duty: altruism, beneficence, compassion, love, loyalty maybe. Well, that's quite a few. These are things that we say are part that which is morally to have and to do. But it is not strictly speaking, anyone's moral duty to do them. In other words, you have no right to be loved by me. If I don't love you, I violate no duty or obligation toward you. It may be a nice thing, above and beyond the call of duty if I love you, have compassion for you, am altruistic, or risk my life to save yours, etc. But none of these things are strictly things of obligation or duty; they're part of what we mean by being a good person or a moral person that is outside that corner of morality that is covered by justice, rights, duties, and obligations, strictly speaking. Now, if I promise to jump in the river if you're drowning and try to save your life even at the expense of my own, what was once an act of compassion now becomes an act of duty. But it does so because of the formal agreement I've entered into with you. Because I promised to do that, you have a just expectation that I will. Before I did that, before I entered into the agreement to jump in and save you, before I became a lifeguard in other words, you have no just expectations that as a bystander I would jump in and try to save you. Nice thing if I do, but I don't violate any of your rights or violate any of my obligations if I don't. Does that answer the question?

Seidman: The distinction, though, is that you could go off on vocational ethics on the point of that obligation.

Jennings: That's one of the things that role ethics do. One of its functions, I think anyway, is that it takes things in the ordinary moral life that are outside the realm of obligations and sticks them into it. So what was supererogatory for a private citizen becomes a duty for a police officer. And, while I don't think the concept of obligation does cover the whole of the moral life, it does pretty much cover the whole range of professional ethics. And that's why the distinction that I introduced at the beginning is important because if you can define a specific area of vocational ethics, you have probably identified an area in which obligation, contract, rights, justice are the basic concepts you have to deal with in your educational programs. If not, then what you're really talking about is teaching general ethics to your vocational students and presumably such a course therefore has to encompass the whole gambit of ethical considerations and just not obligations alone but all of the things that go into making us good human beings.

Wirth: I may be way off base here, but I was sort of supposing that among employers and traditional vocational education when you talk about vocational ethics, the implication is you're talking about the obligations of the worker to the employer. When they say, we want vocational ethics, I'm guessing they're primarily talking about how the worker is supposed to behave. Am I right?

Seidman: No, the RFP defined a working definition as the process and principles that govern one's relationships on the job to other people in various technical--

Miller: In vocational ethics, not only the employer but the other co-workers?

Seidman: The working definition defined it as horizontal and vertical. What we talked about this morning: the rights of a worker as well as the rights that management demands of a worker and what a worker demands reciprocally. I saw it that way; the evolution in thinking, everything fits.

Wirth: You've introduced that but traditionally, it would be more like what I was talking about.

Seidman: Absolutely.

Wirth: You may be in the process of opening an alternative to a tradition that's been there, consciously or unconsciously, for a long time.

Seidman: Absolutely. Exactly what's happened. If you expect anything other than the authoritarian or vertical workplace, then we're introducing something new. Everything we've done is geared toward that kind of workplace. When we redefine what a worker, the workplace, or the meaning of work is, you start to redefine what vocational ethics are.

Wirth: Because people trained in vocational education themselves will become foreman and have responsibilities down instead of up. I don't know whether that's been introduced as a part of that.

Miller: This is sort of a different approach to it, I think. You're talking about the idea of obligation and then above and beyond. It seems to me that in this authoritarian work environment, the obligation aspect is the most important thing. As you move into the socio-technical kind of environment, above and beyond things become more a part of the picture.

We're asking the worker in the socio-technical model to go beyond obligation--

Jennings: At least beyond vertical obligation. Strictly legalistic, contractual obligation.

Wirth: I think you are also dealing with the reciprocal obligation between management and workers, too. It has to do with a climate of trust and open communication which reveals more than just what needs to be revealed to get the work done.

Seidman: The minute it becomes a necessity for the world of work it is no longer a volitional kind of thing. It becomes an obligation which is what you were saying about role obligation before. Trust is integral to the socio-technical workplace. If it's integral too, it is no longer volitional but becomes obligatory. Are we playing games with the concept about work here?

Jennings: No, just as long as we're using the same sense of volitional. You willfully perform your obligations; it's not a matter of necessity. The distinction is really what is obligatory and what is optional. Something like that, morally optimal. There's an interesting question of motivation here. It's an interesting question about the state of our moral culture and this society and the moment. Different people sort of draw this line between the morally optional, the morally required or obligatory in different places, clearly. They want to be very precise and careful about what they put on the obligatory side of the line. A lot of them, some of the most famous moral philosophers writing today like R. M. Hare and John Rawls, want to deny that things like compassion and altruism and so on are in fact obligatory. They say they are nice

things but they are not obligatory. Now lots of common moral intuitions, at least mine, place that line differently and in my own beliefs, yes, you do have to help somebody else. That is not optional, it's obligatory. Altruism can be obligatory for me. So, the question is where do we as a society draw that line and where does each individual person in this society draw that line for his or her own life? This is important at the motivational level because if something like trust or openness is seen as morally optional in the workplace, I think this bears on our moral motivation. People just do not take things that they consider morally optional as seriously. I don't think they act as regularly upon them. If you can get people to redefine something that they once thought was morally optional as now being morally obligatory, you've increased the level of seriousness and attention that people pay to that. You have increased the regularity in which they will behave in a certain way without having to be coerced, threatened, or monitored. Suppose you want a workplace with spontaneity, openness, and trust. You want people to do this without being monitored, without being prodded by management, etc. Probably what that kind of workplace will require is a set of moral attitudes by the participants that the kinds of things that make this workplace function are obligations. Workers need to say to themselves: "I'm a member of something here. Therefore, I have an obligation to make this process work."

Wirth: At the Baldwinsville plant, they worked out, through some kind of consultation, the core values which included the ones we're talking about. Then, at least they claim, that in making decisions about the structure of work and various other things, they felt they had an

obligation to consciously refer to what they called those core values. Is the way we say we're going to do this consistent with what we want and believe in most? So, that's introducing a way of thinking which I think is not typical or traditional. Some agreement on our core values and then continually asking if this choice or that is consistent or inconsistent. So is it all coming together?

Miller: I was wondering about these core values. It goes back to what you said about whether these are things that are just general in nature to being a human being or whether these core values are interpretable in terms of a vocational kind of thing.

Wirth: Max Lerner wrote a book quite a few years ago called America as a Civilization. He said you can call America a business civilization. As he developed that, he was trying to identify what he thought was a basic, unresolved tension in American life: The business tradition operates from a core value which holds that if everyone pursues self-interest overall welfare in the long run will best be served. The other set of values derives from democratic tradition and may even have some roots in our religious values. They have to do with the dignity of the person, the chance to participate in decisions affecting your life, etc. The newer style of work is making some attempt to encompass the cultural values that we associate with the democratic tradition. I think you can feel the tensions between the two.

Seidman: If this continuum from democratic to socio-technical is applicable to all work situations, obviously it's directly applicable to industry, but is it directly applicable to farm occupations, agriculture

occupations, health occupations, to home ec occupations? The whole concept of how you see the human worker interacting with the job.

Wirth: I think one of the old issues is that it doesn't belong in work, period. You've got somebody who has invested his capital, created something, he's risked; and if you contract to work with him, you work under the conditions he prescribes. If you don't like it, quit. This tradition limits democracy to periodic voting by citizens. The other concept of democracy sees it as a way of living, and the way we live with each other. I think our main-line tradition says we should keep it the first way. Democracy is limited to political voting. If you start introducing the new participative style, we'll be in a mess.

Jennings: Was your question whether the dichotomy between authoritarian and socio-technical or democratic workplaces is applicable to other than industrial manufacturing jobs?

Seidman: Yes. Because that is what exists right now. It does not exist in a hospital, medical lab, farm, non-industrial work environment, or kitchen.

Jennings: According to the pessimistic scenario we discussed this morning, you'd find the work force dichotomizing itself into a kind of technological elite characterized by the democratic type. Then you'd have the relatively unskilled group of workers, whose labor would demand less rather than more creativity, characterized undoubtedly by highly authoritarian forms of management. Perhaps even more authoritarian than we presently have because the increasing capability of new technologies for management to monitor and control work. We did not mention this earlier, but it does seem to be relevant.

Wirth: Maybe the more highly educated and less willing would have to be monitored more closely.

Jennings: That's right. So, it's a grim picture but if that's true you wouldn't go from job category to job category asking, "Do you find both?" There are going to be some that would be exclusively authoritarian and some that would be exclusively democratic in the future. That by itself would not undermine the heuristic value of the dichotomy. It would just mean that the pessimistic scenario had come true rather than the optimistic one so the whole work force could have a chance at least of changing back and forth.

Pratzner: A recent poll of teachers conducted by Henrietta Schwartz indicates that teachers are still very dissatisfied with teaching. Morale is very low. The main reason they give is "lack of the ability to change the system." Their principals are either too authoritarian or too egalitarian. In either case they don't get the opportunity to affect the things that they think are critical to them and to the kids. Year after year these polls show much the same thing. One would think that teaching would be ripe for socio-technical developments but it isn't happening yet.

Jennings: I think that point is well taken. I don't think we have to say that it is necessarily. We can say there are skilled jobs some of which are going to be open to the possibility of democratic patterns. Others will remain hierarchical but I think the important point of the claim of the pessimistic scenario is that at the bottom of the heap the technology there doesn't permit the kind of nice democratic vision that

Robert Reich and others foresee. They are going to be sitting at their bench making microchips.

Pratzner: The other thing that troubles me a little bit is the fact that it's very easy in large organizations to see authoritarian styles or democratic styles in operation. It's more difficult to sort things out and get a clear picture in small and medium-sized organizations. Very often small shops, say with maybe three or four mechanics, may very well do a lot of the things that we talk about under participatory management techniques but they're much more difficult to recognize. They are much more casual, you just can't see it there as easily as you can when you have to formalize it between management and organized labor or within large bodies of workers. So I'm not sure if the growth of small to medium-sized firms--which tends to account for most of the growth of new jobs--means a trend toward being authoritarian or less.

Wirth: I think it is true that formalization, impersonalization, and all that comes with size. I had an uncle who had a small machine shop. He always talked about "the men" who were separate from the owner. The last thing he would have ever thought about was democratic administration of the machine shop. "The men" recognized him as the boss but he trusted the mechanics. The quality of their interaction was very human even though they wouldn't have thought about it. I think size of the cell changes the quality of things. I think what's happening is some effort to counter the unfortunate consequences of size by introducing some of the smaller units we're talking about.

Jennings: But, once again the question is the trends, statistics, and where the jobs are going to be coming from in the next 50 years. Is it

going to be in that small entrepreneurial sector or concentrated in industries or chains?

Pratzner: Birch and others think that small and medium-sized firms, rather than the GMs and the large steel companies, is where most of the job growth will occur in the future.

Jennings: The hospital chains are buying up more and more of the hospital beds in this country. So, what you have is institutions that once were community based, independent hospitals run by a board of directors that was a local minister, a local businessman, etc. Now, being formally owned by operations with roughly the same staff and the rest. The size of the workplace doesn't change. The number of people doesn't change but the ethos can change radically because of the difference in the management structure, where they're coming from, what they're responsive to, what their priorities are. Doctors are especially sensitive to it because they have been the last of the professions to be forced out of highly autonomous practices. More and more they are now becoming salaried employees. They don't like it! One of the reasons they don't like it is because they have people telling them how to practice medicine in ways they never did before.

Miller: It seems to me that what we're talking about is training processes more than training a specific kind of content or principles. Is that where we are?

Wirth: Let me bring a fundamental issue. The second model in a very broad sense is a process-oriented model: participation in the process of making ethical decisions, etc. is a need within that one. The earlier model would be more prescriptively oriented. For example, Bruce is

suggesting that an appropriate training device would be case studies where people process and wrestle not knowing which is right but participate in the process of decision making.

Jennings: The dichotomy between process and content is clear; but you can't push that too far. You can't discuss a case study unless you can identify the basic concepts that are important and identify the types of good reasons that can be given for various positions and moral claims that one makes. In this case, he should have done this. No, he should have done that. Well, why? So, it's just not process, it's not just anything goes. There's clearly a determination of relevant content--relevant considerations have to be made by somebody. I think that by and large a skillful teacher can have that determination made by the class without laying it on them in an overly heavy-handed fashion. Part of what instruction in ethics is all about is leading the student to be able to see what the relevant considerations are and what is irrelevant. You have to identify the morally relevant content of a situation. So, it is not content free by any means. It isn't just process. It isn't just getting a bunch of people to sit down and ventilate their--

Seidman: Where does content fall though within the four areas you gave us? Analytical skills is not content. Moral perception is hinged upon content but it is not content per se.

Jennings: That is what that particular one means--being able to identify an ethical issue when it's there. It really means being able to understand the morally relevant considerations in a particular circumstance.

Seidman: If you're minus moral perception, you're unable to recognize a moral issue.

Jennings: But it's not an empty mind that's just prepared waiting; it's already got lots of ethical values floating around in it.

Seidman: That's what I meant. Having taught moral perception implies having taught content somewhere. What is moral imagination?

Jennings: The capacity to see beyond the moral vision of your particular culture, time, or class. Some sense of historical vision and imagination. Some sense of utopian possibilities as it were, to be able to see a better way. It's possible just to take my own personal background. I was brought up in a very conservative community and the ethic I inculcated most of all was the business ethic--the business civilization that Heilbroner describes. At some point, and I don't quite remember when, in high school or college or whatever, I had to exercise some degree of moral imagination to see human goods, purposes, options, and alternative ways of living that were above and beyond that because they were outside my range of experience. That is what developing a moral imagination means and was intended to mean. Again that is content, too, but I guess the tricky thing, the tightrope the Hastings people were trying to walk here was to say, "Look, there are just basic substantive questions that an ethical analysis and an ethical discussion will lead to inevitably. You've got to talk about justice. You've got to talk about rights. You've got to talk about obligations. You've got to talk about beneficence, altruism, etc. There is a content to ethics. But to say that is not to say that any specific moral doctrine or dogma is going to be insisted upon or imposed. And, a course shouldn't have that kind of content; a course shouldn't have a specific doctrinaire position that it takes as it's objective to impose upon the students to accept."

Wirth: The skills in that model seem potentially useful. Would it be useful to have some examples or some cases? Do some materials exist? I was just thinking that if I wanted to get clearer about that and its potential, seeing a case would help.

Jennings: It is very hard to implement and there are practical problems with it of a severe sort in terms of getting a course like this into the curriculum and successfully teaching it. But to lay out the ideas there is a monograph called "The Teaching of Ethics in Higher Education" by the Hastings Center which lays out all these goals. I guess I thought you had seen that but I'll send you a copy. It spells out these various goals and some of the problems and pedagogical issues involved. In terms of actual case studies, we accumulated syllabi from universities and professional schools from all around the country for 3 or 4 years when this research project was underway and got materials and tried to find out what people were actually doing and the experiments with these actual courses. There is not a published book that covers cases in all fields. But there are published case books in various fields, as well as anthologies, readers, textbooks, a ton of stuff. So, it isn't that difficult to get this stuff and take a look at it. They differ from field to field. The case studies used in some fields tend to be one-page hypotheticals. I think business ethics is the most complex. The reason for that is business education, at least at Harvard, is built around the case study method of teaching. They have very, very long and complex management cases that they give to their students at Harvard. When they started up a business ethics course there, the professor naturally had to develop his ethics cases in a way which was compatible with what the

the students were accustomed to. So, he's got very long and complex, interesting business ethics type cases. It's a range and what's useful depends very much on the level of your students and the background the student has already in ethics if any and a lot of things. This is a very demanding model of ethics education. Demanding on the schools, demanding on the teachers, demanding on the students, and it's demanding on the field. There has to be a literature in the area of medical ethics before you can teach a medical ethics course. If nobody has written articles, books, case studies, etc. about it, it is very hard to teach a course on it if the teacher has to write it all up himself or herself. So, this is an extremely demanding model. It does not lend itself to the pervasive method or what you call the infusion approach. In fact, the Center recommended against that in its study and conclusions. It does lend itself to the teaching of general ethics as well as role ethics or professional ethics so that the initial dichotomy doesn't matter even if you decide vocational ethics is just in effect teaching general ethics to vocational students. I don't think there is any particular reason that it has to be more than that in order to be very valuable. If you decide that this might be okay, you could put in the vocational curriculum units or specific courses devoted to ethics in a concentrated fashion. But don't try to put in a little ethics here and a little ethics there. It also demands that your teacher training effort be oriented toward providing the instructors with the special skills that they need in order to teach an ethics course. We, the Hastings Center, don't believe that anybody can pick up some ethics textbook or some classic in ethics, read it over the summer, and then jump in and teach a good ethics course in

the fall. It doesn't mean you have to have an advanced degree in philosophy to teach an ethics course, but it does mean that you have to have some kind of inservice training.

Pratzner: A lot of vocational education takes place in cooperative, on-site training between schools and business. Students meet individually with instructors as well as in groups to review their work experiences and discuss problems. Additionally, there are a lot of students who work outside the school and who have part-time jobs after school hours or in the summer. In other words, students are involved in a lot of other things besides schooling. It seems to me that one could capitalize on personal events, experiences that are happening, events that do happen to discuss many values and ethical questions. You could teach such a course without imposing a set of values or views on students.

Jennings: I don't know. I agree with everything you said up to the point where you took up the problem of infusion. The account you give of what's supposed to go is right on the mark as far as I'm concerned. I'm not sure whether we're disagreeing or not. I did want to make the point that I thought in order to draw on the experiences these students have and in order to lead a discussion to draw moral issues from their experiences takes a teacher whose had some training. Just because you're good at teaching mechanical engineering, woodworking, or whatever you teach doesn't mean you're going to be good at this. So, I wanted to emphasize that point. Number two, perhaps I have the wrong picture in my head about what would go on if you follow the infusion method and have these serendipitous discussions of ethics. All I want to insist upon is continuity, concentration, and focus over time in the instructional

process because I think you need that. The value of discussion of ethics in these courses is the group dynamics that is set in motion among the students in the classroom. They learn from one another and begin to modify their own initial views. If it's so truncated, so short-term each time it arises that you really only have a chance to state your position and move on, the next person states his position and moves on, and so then you have each given a self-report about your view on the morality of the issue but you have not engaged in any real dialogue, give-and-take, or self-transformation. And, that's what we're after, right? I don't think that practically speaking it can be done unless you have a few hours to sit and talk about nothing but the ethical issues. You can't talk about the technical issues for half an hour and the ethical issues for 15 minutes in each class and expect to do the job.

Wirth: I like that style myself. But they (teachers) may say well it's too difficult to implement.

Jennings: That's what I wanted to lead up to also. One suggestion I would have might be partially that. You might try to match the goals you set with the resources you have available to you and not try to take on the whole program of goals the Hastings Center mentions. It's now a widely shared concensus among people who teach professional ethics in colleges and universities that this is pretty much what they're trying to do. So you don't have to accept that whole program in order to make an approach to vocational ethics teaching a valuable thing to do, it seems to me. But you have to be careful to think through what part of that program you might accept and how you might adapt it given your needs, students, and resources, curriculum and so forth. I think at the very

least would be the development of reasoning and perceptual skills to be able to see the moral implications of a piece of behavior rather than to be blind to them. I would think you would want to retain at least those two parts of the program because those are very basic human capacities. But, it's the limited range of things you might want to focus in on--things especially pertinent to the workers' situation instead of units that tackle a lot of moral theory or different kinds of case studies that raise different sorts of issues. You could, presumably, introduce questions of what your rights and responsibilities are to your employer, your fellow workers, consumers, or investors in the firm. How do you deal with conflicts between your responsibilities on the job and your responsibilities at home to your family? In a few minutes we could all sit down and put together a little syllabus of a few, maybe five or six, important discrete questions of ethical conflict and so forth that workers face in real life. You could say that at least we will discuss and try to prepare our students to have the intellectual tools to think about these conflicts they will experience and the dilemmas they will confront. We can't tell them how to resolve the dilemmas but we can try to equip them to understand what is involved in the dilemmas they're going to face. Maybe at least present them with the notion you can think through and sometimes resolve these dilemmas. You don't have to panic or despair, etc. What I guess I'm saying is that I believe it is possible to teach serious ethics subject matter in a vocational high school or vocational curriculum. I think that's possible but I think you need to be very much more focused, very much more disciplined in planning the curriculum than at the university or professional school level if only because there is

less time, instructors are more poorly prepared in terms of their philosophy backgrounds, and students are probably much more limited in the amount of ethical theory and abstraction you want to try to get them to grapple with in these courses. You probably need to keep it very real, very concrete.

Miller: So, we start out with a kid with a mind prepared somewhere else, the home, the church, wherever. We present conflicts that take place within a variety of work environments and let the kids wrestle with these problems for the purpose of identifying the moral issues involved--developing a greater moral sensitivity, a sensitivity to moral issues.

Jennings: Using your metaphor, you'd teach them how to wrestle. You'd teach them the holds; you don't let them street fight with these problems but you make them really wrestle with these problems. I've seen college-level ethics teachers whose approach is to throw this problem out in the class, let them go at it, and see how they resolve it. The process of going at it is in and of itself valuable up to a certain point probably. I like free play; take chances with some ideas and so forth; but I have also seen it be counterproductive. You have students inbibed already in a culture that has a lot of ethical skepticism or they react against what they think of as ethics which, at least with most of my students when they first heard the term, thought of sexual morality exclusively. Is this going to be a course that is going to tell me that I'm not supposed to have premarital sex--that is what ethics meant to them. Students of this sort get turned off to ethical reflection if you throw them in deep philosophical water prematurely.

Pratzner: Well, I don't know. Maybe not in voc ed but someplace. It can't be solved on an individual basis or case by case but it is something a lot of these students are interested in. There is no easy solution. You run the risk of turning them off. Too many students cases about work might not be very relevant but personal dilemmas such as abortion might be.

Jennings: I'm talking about a progression in the course--building up so you don't hit them with the hardest, most complex cases the first day. That's all I mean to say.

Wirth: So, one model of vocational ethics may be to identify the ethical problems. One for the old way of work and one for the new one. The other approach is more situational. You bring more money in and have them get involved in this process of necessary or adequate ethical training. And it sounds like that would require some kind of workshop or training program for instructors who are going to do that. In other words, that requires more than knowing the list of ethics.

Seidman: You cannot worry about role obligation, just concern yourself with general ethics whether it focuses on vocation, or where general ethics melds with vocational ethics. Are there any role-specific, ethical obligations which are a good simplifying factor, a good thing to do? I keep avoiding content which we need to bear in mind needs content and imagination, moral imagination. So, we do have to wrestle with that. We can't obviously solve it now. How do you go about identifying the content that we're talking about here? I think that's what you were talking about. We don't just roll a problem out and let them mud wrestle it. You teach how to recognize the problem, extract the problem from the mass, give mental control, and deal with it.

Jennings: I do think ethical reasoning is a discipline virtually every human being is capable of, I don't think there is any such thing as an ethical expert. I don't view ethics education as a kind of technical education but I think that aesthetics is a discipline. You can have good judgment of art or uninformed and uncultivated judgment of art. Similarly, you can reason about ethical issues well, very badly, or not at all. I just resist the notion that whereas teaching someone how to repair a motor may be a technical science and skill, teaching someone to reason about right and wrong is up for grabs. Your views are as good as my views. I wouldn't even harp on it if I didn't think that attitude was so common in our culture both among teachers and the general population.

Wirth: In terms of this question of content, let's take moral imagination. If I understood you correctly, that has to do with projecting some Utopian kinds of solutions. Adam Curl at Harvard says you don't know what your goals of education are until you clarify your ideas and ideal future. It seems to me that you're saying one thing that happened in American life is we've created different conceptions for designs of work. Getting students involved in some historical understanding of what's come out of American society in these students' eyes. There are two different ways of thinking about people at work. You can't project them as sort of ideal ends and you wouldn't have to make it black and white. It seems to me that the content could be just helping them have an awareness of what's come out of our life and the kind of available choices we make and are making out there.

Miller: I approached this initially with the idea that there was not one moral code to teach. So given that, we need to train analytical

kinds of skills rather than ethical sensitivity or whatever you want to call it. Then the idea would be that the training of those skills would eventually need some kind of appropriate solution of ethical problems. I feel if we do it that way we're really having a lot of faith in the cognitive process of something that is going to weed out the evil from the good or whatever. I'm not so sure that's all that is needed. The reasoning of the Nazis, for example, was flawless in terms of their own efficiency or whatever. But with incredible abuses of human rights, they didn't come up with a moral solution.

Wirth: In a way, I think there's an old issue of the relationship between intrinsic and instrumental values. For example, at the Baldwinsville plant they staked out their central goals. Then when they looked at a policy decision, they referred to their core values (the intrinsic values) and examined which course of action would be helpful (instrumental) in realizing a core value. In one sense, they said "How do we get to what we value most?" But within those two models of work, helping people develop sensitivity to which policy decisions are consistent with the core values in each is making moral choices to me; it's going beyond cognitive processes. Which path? Why?

Seidman: We have to identify the moral principles operating in work environments maybe in a dichotomous way so you know which path you want to follow. There is no way to deal with process and not deal with having the substance under which that process operates. It's the fuel and also the dough of the process.

Miller: How would they get those core values?

Wirth: I think a lot of them are probably what they've learned in their families. The core people from management and labor met with the architects. They sat around for a period of time and hammered out an image of what kind of place would be a good one to work in. I think in one sense they got it by sitting around, exploring what they could agree on. Then they decided to take those values seriously when it came to operational decisions. "Are they consistent or inconsistent with what we said we want?"

Miller: So, who decides what general principles a kid is taught or do they decide for themselves?

Wirth: I'll tell you one way to do it. I've seen Peter Fay use a real, simple earthy kind of exercise. Larry Peirich, head of Quality of Work Life division at Anheiser-Busch, gets people together. He says, "Let's take the mystery out of this. Think of the worst organization or group you've ever been in in your life. Groups or organizations that made you feel rotten; group or organization that made you feel frustrated." People start listing the features. Then, he says "Let's start thinking about groups or organizations you felt good about, that helped you get things accomplished." Finally he says, "The quality of work life idea simply is the effort to help people move from the features of a bad situation to a better one. You've already identified what they are." I haven't really answered your question. I have seen him work that way. What do you pretty much know from your own experience when you feel done in, feel manipulated, or when you feel satisfied? In that case, it's another example of whatever they came up with came out of their process, reflecting on their lives. The alternative would have been for him to

list the characteristics of a rotten organization and a good one. For some reason, he thinks it is important to get people involved.

Jennings: Maybe it's useful to think of two different very general topics that might be a part of a course like this. On the one hand, vocational ethics might try to help the students analyze the workplace they find themselves in as a whole in terms of its form, its organization, and the incentive systems that are working. From a moral point of view, you could try to make human beings more reflective and conscious about the institutions in which they work. This firm is set up badly because it places a premium on people stabbing other people in the back and that's how you rise to the top here. So that's one level. There's a separate, not unrelated but distinct level and that is questions of micro-ethics--personal interaction morality. How do you handle sexual harrassment? How would you decide about whether to become a whistle blower? How do you deal with ratings, fitness reports, or whatever the company calls them? Should you really be candid or is this going to zap someone who doesn't deserve to be zapped? There is grade inflation; what do you do with a system like that? Personal decisions that individuals have to make. Should you tell the supervisor that one of your co-workers has made a very serious mistake that endangers another worker who forgot to turn off the valve? What should you do? You turn the valve off, but then what should you do? Do you go to him or her and say, "Hey, you really blew this one. It's not that I'm going to watch over you but if it happens again, I'll have to go to the supervisor." Or do you go directly to the supervisor? Or do you keep quiet? These are the personal ethics decisions. So, the course might try to include both things and

not be limited to one or the other. The tendency, probably, in a lot of places, would be to go for the latter. Talk about the personal ethics, harrassment, etc. It's real, it's tangible, it does happen. On the other hand it doesn't rock the boat. It doesn't threaten management. It doesn't make the employees more self-conscious about the nature of power and authority in the workplace particularly. It's helping them to live together in peace and more or less do the right thing. But when you get them to thinking about institutional issues, policy, and the justice of the company's policies toward women, not just the question of individual sexual harrassment, what should I do? But, if you see the company discriminates against women, if a woman who does the same job as you is making a lot less money, if you start the work force thinking about those questions, you are doing something frankly more critical of the status quo. My hunch is there might be a tendency in some places which talk about vocational ethics to say, "Let's stick to the micro-level." My recommendation is I would like to see a program go forth that includes the consideration of ethical analysis of institutions as well as the personal interaction problem.

Wirth: There is one dilemma which I have been hearing all along: talking about the vocational ethic from kindergarten through junior college. It seems to me that everything we've talked about says that unless the management part is somehow part of this same discussion, there is something kind of unreal or subversive about it. I don't know what you do with that but I just think that identifying the fact that there's an awareness and a new way of thinking about good work. Eddie Porey from Chrysler said, "I won't come in there to work on work effectiveness

unless top management is in on that process." I think eventually that needs to be or you have a special problem.

Jennings: It might be worth taking a look at what is being in fact taught in management school under the name of business and management ethics. See what the top strata is being exposed to in the way of ethics. It might not be a bad idea to coordinate teaching efforts in management schools on the one hand and vocational ethics program on the other.

Seidman: For medical ethics classes and nurses, the problems they are contending with at the SIU School of Medicine are personal problems as much as they are ethical problems. Would there not be some value in those also?

Jennings: Undoubtedly, especially if you expect some of your students to go into the health care industry.

Jennings: I was reacting to the fact that nursing is in a very interesting period right now. It is desperately trying to be recognized as a profession in its own right. There is a great push toward increasing the educational level and credentialling of nurses. There is a tremendous turnover in the profession. When you talk to nurses about nursing ethics, the thing that makes them the maddest is if you collapse nursing ethics into medical ethics. This is an entirely different subject; nurses do not see the same problems in the same way doctors do. There are tremendous conflicts in perception and nurses want to argue there are conflicts of obligation. It is wrong for a nurse to be seen as a subordinate of the doctor obeying his orders in a sort of military fashion which goes back a long way in the history of nursing. They want to say, "No! If a doctor misprescribes for a patient, we're going to countermand that order and do what we know

is right because we have to. Ethically we have to because it is a matter of our professional ethics to do so." As professionals with a code of ethics, they can use that as a defense in court. If they do blow a whistle on a doctor and get fired or countermand a doctor's order and get hauled up on charges, which has happened, the nurse's defense, part of it is: "I'm a professional too, and my professional ethics say to do this." So, it's very sensitive with them now. In a way, it's a process of trying to move from being a vocation or an occupation into being a profession. And, at some level the dimension of nursing issues and medical issues would be very pertinent to a vocational education program on vocational ethics.

Miller: I appreciate the hard work you've all done very much.